

# THE MINORITY OF ONE

Independent Monthly Publication, Dedicated to the Elimination of All Thought Restrictions Except for the Truth

*"There was truth and there was untruth, and if you clung to the truth even against the whole world, you were not mad."*—GEORGE ORWELL

Vol. III, No. 9 (22)

Copyright, 1961  
THE MINORITY OF ONE, INC.

17

Address for subscriptions and correspondence:  
P.O. Box 544, Passaic, N. J.

Editor:  
M. S. Arnoni

September, 1961

## Permanent Brinkmanship

# The Manufactured Crisis

THE MINORITY OF ONE  
IN THIS ISSUE:

September, 1961

### Exit Chiang

### To Set the Record

Straight —Prof. E. B. Zeisler

### Another Type of Deterrence —Sidney Lens

### Education in Disguise

—Prof. G. A. d'Amato

### Election Booth Blues (Poem) —D. C. DeJong

### The Anatomy of a Peace Effort

### Berlin: Background of a Crisis

—Prof. J. M. Swomley, Jr.

• The  
Gratuitous  
Grotesque

• The  
Fascist  
Inter-  
national

—M. H. Lund

—G. Herde

• Atom Tests  
Can Be  
Monitored

• American  
Students  
Awaken

—S. D. Speeth

—J. Eisen

and other articles  
and features

If war breaks out over Berlin, it will be a war of miscalculation. President Kennedy's public comments indicate that the Berlin crisis was precipitated for other purposes than an immediate world conflagration. His address to the nation, on July 25th, was a rather awkward combination of messages intended respectively for the Soviet leaders and for the American public. With reference to Berlin, and beyond what was intended for domestic consumption, the emphasis was on American readiness to negotiate an understanding with the Soviets. While tactical reasons caused the President not to include in his address any specific proposals for the solution of the Berlin problem, his recurring diplomatic motif was American readiness to negotiate a change of the status quo. The variations of this motif ranged from a "readiness to remove actual irritants in West Berlin," to a willingness to have the "legality of our right in Berlin . . . submitted to international adjudication." For the "benefit" of the American people and legislators, however, these overtures were heavily wrapped in alarmist appeals for increased armament and military spending.

The President does not expect the Berlin crisis to culminate in general war. During his press conference on July 19th he stated that "the American people and this Government and the Congress must realize that we are in a long struggle which we will be involved with for a great many years against very powerful countries, with nearly a billion people in them." On July 25th, he spoke of "courage and perseverance in the years to come." The President added that "Our efforts . . . must not be obsessed by any single manufactured crisis." The reference to "a great many years" and the warning against obsession with a single crisis make it clear that the President does not expect the present Berlin crisis to turn the cold war into a hot war. Rather he anticipates a series of cold war crises. Obviously, the military build-up recommended by the President was not necessitated by the Berlin situation; he said, "We face a challenge in Berlin, but there is also a challenge in Southeast Asia . . . We face a challenge in our own hemisphere." The military build-up is not for the short-range objective; it is the beginning of long-range preparations to upset the prevailing international balance of power.

The diplomatic dialogue between President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev with regard to Berlin hardly offers itself for any misunderstanding as to which of them manufactured the war hysteria. While Khrushchev continues to apply for diplomatic negotiations amidst assurances that Western interests would be fully respected, President Kennedy persists in interpreting these applications as creating a war situation. In his July 25th address there was an incriminating inconsistency, which threw light upon the responsibility for the "manufactured crisis." He undertook to justify "the series of decisions by the Administration" as a reaction to Khrushchev's "grim warnings about the future of the world, his aide-mémoire on Berlin, the subsequent speeches and threats he and his agents have launched and the increase in the Soviet military budget." A latter part of the President's own speech clearly indicates that this "setting of the stage" amounted to an outright falsification of the sequence of events.

Khrushchev's aide-mémoire was handed to Kennedy on June 4th. Increases of Soviet military outlays were announced on July 8th. Kennedy himself, however, repeated that his recommendations to Congress for supplemental military build-ups began in March. Obviously, steps undertaken by the Soviets in June and July could not have provoked American steps in March. The President's own account made clear his false placement of responsibility for the increased arms race.

If the President does not intend to precipitate a general war using Berlin as a pretext, why does he insist on depicting the Berlin situation as a war situation, and why does he demand legislation that could be justified only by anticipating war?

The most articulate answer to this question was provided by a newspaperman whose access to Washington-behind-the-scenes is quite privileged. In the July 23rd NEW YORK TIMES James Reston wrote that "Berlin is regarded here (in Washington) for the moment not as a military emergency but as a political opportunity." Reston informs us that the political opportunity "is being used to get a lot of things done that President Kennedy wanted to do, anyway, but could not get done without the lash of Khrushchev's threats." Since the only threats by Khrushchev are those falsely imputed to him, the conclusion from Reston's report is obvious. He anticipates it and denies its correctness; he does not, however, produce a single supporting argument on behalf of the denial. Antithetically, he suggests: "This does not

(Continued on page 16)

## Towards the U.N. General Assembly

# EXIT CHIANG?

The maneuvers to prevent the seating of Chinese representatives in the United Nations, schemed up during the recent Washington visit of Chiang Kai-shek's deputy Chen Cheng, will clearly emerge soon after the opening of the General Assembly on September 19th. The overwhelming international pressure for China's admission will not suffice for a gracious reversal of the obstructionist American position. For such a reversal our diplomats lack the necessary realism as well as the true concern for the welfare of the international organization. Even if they no longer succeed in blocking the most populous nation from the "assembly of nations," its admission will come about over American protests.

The American diplomats have little leeway in the molding of a new China policy. They are the prisoners of their own propaganda. For years they have been "teaching" the American people that to recognize China in any way would be a repugnant act against peace and international decency. The propagandistic expediencies of our State Department all too often become that very department's strait-jackets. Thus when it wishes to adopt a more realistic attitude towards one problem or another, it cannot. Then a strange process occurs: no longer does our diplomacy shape our propaganda; our propaganda shapes our diplomacy.

Yet, the truth is that the United Nations needs China's participation as much as China needs to participate. That our policy remained for years oblivious of this truth resulted from our determination to use the U.N. rather than to serve it. This infidelity has manifested itself not only in our China policy but also in the misuse of U.N. agencies in the Congo.

To be sure, we are not the only infidels in the U.N. France's recent defiance of the U.N. in the Bizerte conflict provides a case in point. And Chairman Khrushchev's demands for a troika Secretariat-General certainly in no way enhances the effectiveness of the U.N.

Khrushchev's troika, however, has been prescribed by him for all important international agencies. His true intentions pertaining to one international agency may provide a clue to his intentions pertaining to others. In his report on the Vienna conference with President Kennedy, Khrushchev alluded to the negotiability of his troika formula in disarmament inspection. It seems that

the troika "principle" is a mere bargaining position and that "under conditions of general and complete disarmament," a single replacement for Mr. Hammerskjold could be agreed to as well.

The admission of China, making the U.N. more representative of the world than it has ever been, could provide a new starting point in diplomacy. Unfortunately, the political reassertion of small nations will rather cause the American attitude towards the U.N. to deteriorate further. More and more occasions may arise to manifest how conditional is our devotion to the U.N.

There will be one immediate and heartening effect of China's admission if and when it comes about: the U.N. will become a more honorable forum, ridding itself of the representatives of a corrupt clique which, shaken off by its own people, now oppresses the unfortunate Formosans.

August 2, 1961

### THE MINORITY OF ONE INDEPENDENT MONTHLY PUBLICATION

published by

THE MINORITY OF ONE, INC.  
77 Pennington Ave.  
P. O. Box 544  
Passaic, N. J.

#### SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

	1 yr.	2 yrs.
United States	\$5.00	\$9.00
Canada	\$5.25	\$9.50
Other foreign subscription rates		

submitted on request.

Material published herein may be reproduced upon written permission from THE MINORITY OF ONE, INC., provided proper credit is given. Unsigned contributions are written by M. S. Arnoni.

#### NO COMMERCIAL ADVERTISING ACCEPTED

Second-class postage paid at  
Passaic, N. J.

# To Set the Record Straight

By Ernest B. Zeisler

In the *Journal of the American Medical Association* for July 22 (177:143, 1961) there is an abstract of an article in the June 29 issue of the *New England Journal of Medicine* (264:1323, 1961) saying that "Forty seven per cent (62 out of 137 cases) of paralytic poliomyelitis cases in Massachusetts during 1959 had received 3 or more inoculations" of Salk vaccine.

This information should have been widely publicized early in 1960. Why was it held back for 18 months, during which the Salk vaccine was still being praised and pushed by the very journals which knew how little it was worth?

To the piece of official lying to the public by the U. S. Health Department on the Salk vaccine can be added the deception and misstatements about fluoridation of water supplies. Eisenhower's Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Arthur S. Flemming, now President of the University of Oregon, says that scientific research has proved that fluoridated water, drunk from infancy, prevents 2 out of 3 cavities, that it is effective throughout life, and that it has been proved to be completely safe. Mr. Flemming's statements are false, and they have been shown to be so by Dr. Frederick Exner of Seattle in repeated publications.

The Salk vaccine quackery of the A.M.A., the U. S. Public Health Department, and the National Foundation is an instance of the standards of ethics of medical societies and government agencies. The American public is being unmercifully deceived by the false claims made for Crest, a dentifrice approved by the American Dental Association; it is no better than many other dentifrices, but much money is being made by its promoters.

We read of the death of Whittaker Chambers, but the reports were very brief. Was there perhaps a death-bed confession of his perjury and treachery in permitting himself to be used in framing Alger Hiss? If there was, it would presumably be suppressed by our "free press."

The big boondoggle seems to be coming. President Kennedy is turning over to the Pentagon the project of building shelters against nuclear fallout. How fatuous can one be? Allowing some 180 persons per shelter, there would be required about 1,000,000 shelters. What kind of air would the occupants breathe? What kind of plumbing would be at their disposal? Where would they get water? What would be the arrangements for lighting, especially when the power plants (wouldn't their personnel have to take shelter?) would probably be quickly destroyed? This is all such nonsense that no rational person will take it seriously. The shelters would be of no value to the American people. But this does not make them valueless. They will cost many billions of dollars, and to the contractors and land speculators the project will not be valueless.

Last year a group of Quakers, who are believers in God and oppose Communism, spent several weeks as observers in Cuba. Their report was published in this country, but has been seen by few Americans. Another Quaker group was to go to Cuba last January, and had visas issued by the State Department. The day before they were to leave, their visas were cancelled by the State Department, which would give no explanation other than that the visit would be "contrary to the best interests" of the country. If the best national interests are to lie to the public about conditions in Cuba, then the State Department was right. But only then.

President Kennedy is saying that the Soviets are not justified in fearing West German rearmament because the West Germans are pledged not to manufacture nuclear or chemical weapons. But the Soviets do not want the West Germans to possess such weapons, regardless of who manufactures them. Adenauer has asked for such weapons, and many of our militarists and politicians support his request. There are now such weapons in West Germany, although nominally they are under our control. If the control is given to NATO, then the commander of all of its ground forces, former Hitler-General Hans von Speidel, will become the trust-holder.

Dr. Zeisler, formerly Clinical Associate Professor of Medicine at the Chicago Medical School, has just been appointed as Clinical Professor of Preventive Medicine at the University of Illinois. He is a permanent contributor to TMO, and his study, "The Great Salk Vaccine Fiasco," appeared in the June, 1960 issue.

# Another Type of Deterrence

By Sidney Lens

Seldom in history have nations remained moral for any length of time. We may take it as axiomatic that when a nation is not bellicose it is only because it is either weak, or so well situated that it can afford to rest on the status quo. Even relatively peaceful countries such as Sweden have at one time or another used violence against other nations. The United States — by European standards a peaceful power — also has a spotted record. We need only recall the wars against weak nations such as Mexico and Spain. From 1775 to 1923 alone the United States Army was involved in 110 military conflicts.

The danger of war, then, is inherent in the very concept of national sovereignty. Each state has its own economic and social interests, and its own power (military or otherwise) to defend those interests. In critical moments, when it believes that its status or existence is threatened by another nation-state, it will use military force to defend itself.

Most Americans believe that military force is in the final analysis the only deterrent. But this is a gross oversimplification, and not entirely correct either. There are historical periods when social revolution has been an even greater deterrent than the military. Napoleon's armies would never have advanced as far as they did if it were not for the force of the French Revolution which found converts everywhere and which undermined France's enemies. Weak nations could not have staved off great military powers if it were not for the deterrent force of social revolution. The diplomatic deterrent can also be an effective one at times. All too often the relationship of the great powers has been so evenly balanced that other nations, weak in military strength, have been able to improve their status by clever diplomacy. Even the strong sometimes enhance their position through pitting one enemy against the other, thus immobilizing both. The examples of different types of deterrents make history a rewarding study.

Until World War I, the United States used as its "deterrent" the policy of isolation, or neutralism, or — put more bluntly — playing off one side against another. If the thirteen colonies in 1776 had not allied with France against Britain there would have been no United States. To defend its position in the Western Hemisphere against Spain, the United States came to an understanding with Britain. Against weaker powers, such as Mexico, the United States, as already indicated, used military force; but to stave off stronger powers it relied on the proverbial playing off of both ends against the middle. It compensated for its military and economic inferiority by diplomatic manoeuvring.

Nazi Germany, while it was rebuilding its military deterrent, used a clever diplomatic deterrent. It convinced the Western powers to permit it to rearm and to gobble up pieces of territory by posing to them the "threat of Russian Communism." The advanced West, ever fearful of social instability, ever concerned that social revolution would engulf it, yielded grudgingly to this diplomatic blackmail on the theory that Hitlerism was the lesser evil and would finally be appeased.

The Soviet Union, for its part, has used a non-military deterrent to defend itself — the threat of internal revolution. This has proved itself to be the most effective deterrent of our historical epoch; it made possible the emer-

gence of Russia from a weak, inconsequential economic nation to one of the two major power blocs. At Brest-Litovsk in 1918 Trotsky broadcast to the workers and soldiers of Germany over the heads of the German leaders urging them to rebel. The Germans, fearful of revolt at home, had to give serious consideration to this threat. (There is little doubt that the rebellion of the sailors of Kiel, which presaged the German revolution of 1918-1919, was a major factor in the decision of the Kaiser to sue for peace — even though not a single inch of his country was as yet in enemy hands.)

For a decade and a half the United States has relied on an accretion of military power as its primary deterrent to the spread of Soviet power.

To some Americans this has been proof positive that military deterrence must be the main prong of American strategy — important enough so that it utilizes \$45 billion a year of the budget. But this begs the question and clouds the issue. The point isn't whether it can gain a momentary tactical advantage, but whether as a policy it secures the status of the nation it allegedly defends. In that sense the strategy of (military) deterrence has been a fiasco.

The first serious limitation of the theory of deterrence is that it has been incapable of decisive action in revolutionary situations. Theoretically, a great power should find it simple to defeat ill-equipped nationalist units. But it doesn't work out that way. A century ago, Britain conquered all of India with scarcely 100,000 troops. Today, France has committed much larger numbers in both Viet Nam and Algeria but has been incapable of achieving victory. Military superiority by itself has proven ineffective against national revolution in Viet Nam, Algeria, Ghana, the Belgian Congo, and other trouble spots. It may stalemate a revolution (as in Algeria), but it has shown itself incapable of defeating it. Since most of the world is underdeveloped, and since most of the underdeveloped areas are now in the midst of revolution, this particular limitation of the military deterrent is a highly important one. Military power, characteristically, has been the big stick behind diplomatic power. But this no longer obtains in the areas involved in national revolution. Here nationalism proves itself a more effective deterrent against the West than the military power of the West.

An even greater limitation to the military deterrent flows from its auxiliary effects. It is wrong to think of military deterrence as merely a military matter; it has political and social consequences of overriding significance. It leads to the support of the status quo in the external world — which is fatal during a period of revolution — and to a trend towards the garrison state inside the United States.

The policy of military deterrence requires a network of military allies and military bases in other countries. The United States therefore finds itself in a position of trading aid for military bases, or supporting conservative regimes in the underdeveloped areas, because they are the only ones willing to form military alliances. It is axiomatic that new, revolutionary, nations should eschew such alliances. Their orientation is towards economic development. They seek to satisfy their people through social improvement rather than the promise of military conquest. It is only the static nations that are willing to become military partners of the West. For them military aid is an important factor in maintaining internal control of their popula-

tions. It is also a means of enriching corrupt officials. America's most fervid allies in the underdeveloped areas have also been the world's most socially-backward regimes — Formosa, Thailand, Jordan, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, etc., etc. Further, the policy of military deterrence commits the United States to defending its NATO allies in their colonialist ventures — or at least not seriously challenging them. In critical situations the decision of American policy is with its military, rather than social, considerations. Thus the policy of military deterrence ends with the United States' becoming the major prop of a status quo which is crumbling everywhere. It is an ineffective policy that can lead — and has led — only to further and further setbacks.

A second consequence of military deterrence is that it transforms the United States itself in the military image. Nowadays *whole* nations are totally involved in warfare — either in production or in the front lines. The civilian population, like the military, must therefore be welded into a disciplined force, ready to obey orders. The loyalty, security and similar programs are meant precisely to develop the military *élan* within the population. If our reliance for defense is to be primarily on military preparedness, we need a conformist people ready to obey orders unquestioningly. Thus the attractiveness of the United States as a forward-looking, progressive nation, born of revolution, declines. Instead the image of the U. S. overseas is one of stifling national and social revolution abroad, and regressing or standing still at home.

By any standard of logic or history the evidence indicates that the strategy of military deterrence in the current epoch not only does not prevent further decline of Western influence — it guarantees it.

America's task is to perfect *another* defense that *will* preserve its status.

In a revolutionary world, with more than thirty-five national revolutions since the war, it seems clear that the obvious means of maintaining and extending American influence is through a social offensive. Just as the United States itself could not be preserved in the 1930's without a program of social reformism, so the world today can not be defended from totalitarianism without a progressive social program. It can not survive part-rich, part-poor; the day of revolutionary equalization is at hand. And that nation will sustain its position most effectively which joins the "revolution of rising expectations" rather than stands aside or hinders it. Only through a social offensive can the United States deter its decline.

Viewed in this light, any program for disarmament or banning of nuclear tests must mesh with the social deterrent. It is probably impossible for the United States to disarm without a major social transformation internally and a reoriented non-militarist policy externally. But assuming that it were possible, it would not promote a *final* peace unless it were part of the mechanism of social transformation. The social deterrent and disarmament are related and inseparable strategies that must be promoted together.

Our choice is not between something perfect and something in which there is a chance of failure. It is a choice between a policy of military deterrence which *guarantees* our decline and perhaps condemns us to thermonuclear extinction, or a policy of social deterrence which is the only hope that mankind can survive and that we as a nation will move forward.

Mr. Lens is a Chicago labor leader, author and lecturer. This article is based on a lecture delivered at a Conference of the Committees of Correspondence in Chicago.

## Education in Disguise

By Guy Albert d'Amato

Incomplete concept of education. Entertainment and education divorced. Need for reunion. Entertainment versus the school. British radio. The English and American concepts of entertainment. Educating the public want. Importance of effort in learning. The promotion of excess.

Formal education is only a small part of total education meant to give an organized basis for a more rapid progress in intellectual development. But whether or not formal education takes place, education will go on for better or for worse in one way or another. In short, we cannot escape it. If it does not come to us in a toga, it will reach us in a guise of entertainment to determine the development of our moral and intellectual character. Hence, entertainment is really not only a form of education, but also the most important factor in mass education — i.e. of the average man as well as of the superior mind. A people's entertainment determines its moral and intellectual characters and either nourishes or destroys its potentialities for improvement.

Entertainment, then, is a matter of tremendous social significance. There is really no such relation as entertainment versus education. Entertainment *is* education, and is not less so merely because it is informal. As much can be said of one as of the other, for example, that neither entertainment nor formal education can be wrong unless it sets up the wrong goal of mental progress. There is, therefore, nothing wrong with a preponderance of entertainment programs on radio and television if that should prove to be the best way to educate a people. What is wrong lies in our concept which, in spite of history and anthropology proving the contrary need, practically divorces entertainment from education; and on that score, defiles the choice, quality, and content of its themes. At no time and nowhere have the two been so far removed from each other as in our American way of life: and the results are well on the way of proving the fact that we cannot practice one apart from the other without serious consequences in our social and mental development. Even formal education must take the relation of the two into account, not only to the extent of encouraging the pursuits of the better kinds of entertainment by precept and example, but also to the greater extent of nurturing the whole mind on the basis of sound thinking in order to insure the autonomous power of discrimination.

Thus, it is not the *fact* of entertainment, but the *kind* of entertainment that matters. And

Professor d'Amato is a faculty member of Tufts University at Medford, Mass., the author of several volumes, and a permanent contributor to TMO.

<sup>1</sup>The whole tenor of our radio practice, even in the broadcast of informational material, is attested by the following report on The Voice of America, a radio channel for propagandizing our way of life. The report appeared some time ago in *The Christian Science Monitor*:

*"While the Voice of America in many places appears to be gaining in popularity, it still lags behind the British Broadcasting Corporation in its appeal in most areas. The reason frequently given is that the BBC broadcasts are more objective and newsworthy, an indication that the Voice may still be underestimating the level of intelligence and sophistication in the people it is trying to reach."* That is not so much the result of conceit as of the fact that it is the way the American mass-media treat American audiences.

since it is a form of education, training in appreciation is as much required for that as it is in any other form. To miss this point is a habit that comes from our conceptual separation of entertainment and education. Motivation and training of a sort are necessary for both types of education, formal and informal, but are to be attained in a quite different manner — in one case, directly by conscious and organized guidance; and in the other, indirectly by intuition, curiosity, and experience. In the last, therefore, motivation must ride solely upon the material it seeks, and derive its training therefrom — which material, in radio and television, is the substance of the programs they offer. The highest forms of music, drama, literature, and art are no less media of entertainment than are radio and television. Nor can they be said to be more recreational, since entertainment of any kind is educational, and all forms of education are re-creative in one way or another for better or for worse. With regard to the mass media, our unrelated concepts of education and entertainment overlook two extremely important effects of entertainment upon the mind: first, the strictly educational impact of the content on knowledge and attitudes; and secondly, the moral and aesthetic impact of the quality of the content upon character and taste. These together make up education. While we are coming now to admit the fact academically, in practice we still think of education mostly in terms of informational matter: and of entertainment, as something distinct and apart from, and even contrary to, education. Until we come to *act* upon the fact that both are the same thing in different terms, we shall get nowhere with our schools, and nothing from them but narrow experts. The forces of entertainment surrounding the school — i.e. of the kind of entertainment which owes neither alliance nor allegiance to anything but financial profit — are now too powerful to be ignored: and it takes no research to see the very conspicuous fact that already they are beginning to nullify the moral and intellectual purpose of the school. This is a new factor in the social pattern of which we yet take no account whatever. We must somehow cope with it in the school. And if, outside the school, we are to educate at all through radio and television, it must be largely through the improvement of the general level and quality of entertainment. We have but to look at the British Broadcasting Corporation to see this principle at work. Symphonic concerts, lectures on all sorts of subjects, full-length plays undistorted, commercially unsponsored news commentaries, and comedies of a high order should comprise a larger proportion of the total output. Five or ten per cent is not enough to counteract the overwhelming impact of coarse and distorted material.

Broadcasting full-length drama is the rarest of events on the American radio and television networks. England not only abounds in these, but records them purposely for repeat performances. Our radio is totally ignorant of the value of repetition in that respect outside its "commercials" wherein it is "scientifically" practiced to the point of psychological distraction. We do have symphonic concerts and a complete opera periodically during a season, but they stand in perpetual danger of being discontinued, and sometimes are. The history of American radio programs is littered with cases of good entertainment which came to an untimely end, or gradually deteriorated in order to compete with the air-infesting lowlier forms that are longer-lived and often survive a generation or two.

Thus, the difference between the American and English concepts of entertainment has caused tremendously different effects in practice: on the American side, it has placed the good in the weak and precarious position of having to compete with the bad while, on the British side it has forced the bad into the more desirable position of having to compete with the good. That the difference is tremendous we see demonstrated by the fact that two entirely different worlds of entertainment have been built on a matter of emphasis alone — and there should be no doubt about which is the better one to live in. Hence, what seems to be merely a matter of emphasis in theory becomes in the long run a difference in the character of a people.<sup>1</sup>

Some contenders, assuming a democratic pose, are sure to object on the assumption that the British way does not give the majority what it wants. There is more than one salient answer to that objection. But we have sufficient evidence of the easily ascertainable fact that the English public prefers what it is getting. This author, for one, does not believe our own majority is basically worse than that of England. That we are worse in matters of taste, judgment, and intelligence is the hidden conclusion of that seemingly solicitous, but commercially inspired objection. Our patriotic and democratic arguments often end with insulting ourselves. If the American public is given a longer chance than commercial interests will allow for better programs, it will do then what it does now — that is, it will want what it can get. One cannot want better until one learns to want better; and thus, through the education of taste by example and experience, will come to want a larger proportion of good entertainment — i.e. the kind of entertainment which produces deeper satisfaction because it provides the opportunity for increasing the significance of one's life. On the other hand, those who will not listen to better programs either must come in time to listen for want of something to occupy their leisure (and thus

gradually come to benefit by it), or must seek some other occupation which, because of the effort involved will automatically prove better than being a radio sponge.

Moreover, the case of the non-listener is not an unfortunate situation; for, less radio-listening under any circumstances is not to be deplored. There should be less addiction to the mass-media for the sake of allowing a wider scope to the autonomous ability to think — a fact which Europeans, again, recognize by confining broadcasting to certain hours of the day. A sane limit of indulgence in the mass-media is a point which even our psychologists carefully avoid discussing in public because it stands in opposition to the aims of the commercial interests involved.

It should be clear by this time in our discussion that all the evils of the mass-media do not hinge upon the nature and substance of program-content. Apart from content, there is a very real danger in the fact alone that radio and television, the most enticing of the mass-media, operate on the basis of perpetual temptation. One cannot always hold out against it even when there is strong reason for exercising one's effort in a more fruitful occupation. Thus, contrary to the popular belief, it can be accounted a real blessing to the benefit of the so-called blessing of radio and television; for, even to give only the best programs perpetually can ultimately have a detrimental effect on three important factors in mental development. These are: time for thinking, effort at learning, and the ability to read.

The lure of perpetual entertainment, then, even of the best kind, encourages the reduction of time for vital thinking, not only along paths of one's own choosing, but also on the material offered by the program. It also promotes the reduction of one's effort at learning which, despite the amount of instruction in the program, really amounts to less learning; for, there seems to be a ration of some kind between degree of effort and amount of learning. In other words, the less is the effort that goes into learning, the less remembered is the subject. And lastly, perpetual entertainment by radio and television reduces the need for reading, and thereby discourages the ability to deal more extensively with verbal symbols.

If psychologists are correct on the relation of language and thinking, then radio and television, regardless of program-content, can eventually lead to the destruction of thought and imagination in those addicted to the magic box. Hence, less exposure is as necessary as better programs, both equally vital to social progress through the development of the individual and should therefore be insured by and within the operation of the mass-media.

But less radio-listening and fewer listeners at a time is just what commercial broadcasting does *not* want, for it strives for the devastating ideal of *everybody listening all the time*. The achievement of that ideal is to the interest of the broadcaster rather than to the welfare of the public; and worse, it is disguised under the nobler ideal of public service. It is true, in a very limited sense only, that broadcasters give what the public wants, but they do it by continuously "educating" the audience to want what it gets in the *direction of getting worse*. To think of entertainment in terms of education would automatically establish the *direction of getting better*. Our reversed direction in this matter is a clear symptom of the fact that there is something fundamentally wrong with our working concepts of entertainment, recreation, and education; for, our real concepts are not those which we profess, but only those which we put to work. Our direction cannot be otherwise than what it is when the motive of profit must outweigh the improvement of listeners.

## Three Cheers

- FOR ROBERT KENNEDY, Attorney General, NEWTON MINOW, chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and LEROY COLLINS, president of the National Association of Broadcasters, for their efforts to improve the quality of television programs.
- FOR SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, chairman of the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee, and CONGRESSMAN EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, for sponsoring legislation to stiffen antitrust laws and to pin responsibility for price fixing on corporate executives.
- FOR THE U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT for promoting legislation that would limit the tax deductability of business entertainment allowances.
- FOR DR. ROBERT MISHELL of San Francisco and EDWARD C. MAZIQUE and LORIN E. KERR of Washington, D. C. for organizing groups of physicians, who in opposition to A.M.A. support medical care for the aged through Social Security.
- FOR STERLING M. McMURRIN, U.S. Commissioner of Education, for speaking out against the tendency to identify and to stigmatize anyone with liberal economic and political views as "Communist" or "fellow traveler."
- FOR EDWARD R. MURROW, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, for re-engaging Reed Harris, who had been forced to resign from that agency under pressure by the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy.
- FOR SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS for promoting legislation that would require loan lenders to inform borrowers about the true interest rates.
- FOR SENATOR J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT for warning against extreme rightist political and propaganda activities by the military.
- FOR CHARLES D. MAY, professor of pediatrics at N. Y. University's Medical Center, LOUIS S. GOODMAN, chairman of the department of pharmacology at the University of Utah, DAVID P. BARR, president of the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, WILLIAM B. BEAN of Iowa University's School of Medicine, LOUIS LASAGNA of Johns Hopkins University, MARTIN CHERKASKY, director of New York's Montefiore Hospital, JULIUS B. RICHMOND, professor of pediatrics at the University of New York in Syracuse, ALLAN M. BUTLER of the Physicians Forum, and all other physicians, who support legislation that would authorize the U.S. Government to test the correctness of advertising claims for drugs.

### Election Booth Blues

On the chosen days you can see us marching as if to principles, all us broad-phrased ones jostling one another with adages and incomparable morals, heading for a shrine called: Democracy only.

We overhear and observe promises without shock, as if no more than swallows had arrived in proper time at Capistrano; no one grieves, and no one recoils from the season's terrible balm.

Afterwards over beer, or milder over parlor tea, we survey past errors with insouciance and companionably agree that politics like iron pills are deplorable, all things considered and adjured.

On election Tuesdays it behoves us to keep humor at bay as if it were a wayward child, and we lay a prayer-book open for a next holy day when convictions and a sort of faith have to be retrieved and savored.

Even while our wits suggest that all candidates should be set adrift in leaking canoes, time keeps nudging us onward with sly habits, soliciting caprices and promises, all simpering for seduction.

David Cornel DeJong

# The Anatomy of a Peace Effort

The lead article in the July, 1961 issue of *THE MINORITY OF ONE* was entitled "Memo to the Peace Movement: For an American Alternative." In it was presented an analysis of the monolithic system by which American foreign policies are determined. The means were traced by which our powers-that-be circumvent democracy and put truly vital issues outside the domain of legitimate public controversy. The existence of an effective Paper-and-Air-Wave Curtain (that keeps the mainstream of the American public in utter ignorance of even the possibility of alternatives to the bellicose international orientation of the American Government) was alleged. It was further alleged that the American press and broadcasting industry limit public discussion to the narrow range of whatever policies emanate from Washington and to advocacies still further to the right. Presenting the activities of the various small peace groups as primarily movements registering their moral protest rather than attempting to alter the dangerous trend of events, the "Memo" concluded that no peace activity in America stands a chance of becoming an historic factor until the Paper-and-Air-Wave Curtain is punctured. The suggestion was made that the various American peace movements launch a campaign of protest of the monolithic nature of the American press and broadcasting industry. It was further advocated that a big national daily newspaper which would counteract the insulating effectiveness of the mass media be established. The "Memo" ended with a concrete appeal to a number of prominent individuals in the peace movement and to various groups to call a national conference, specifically to plan an assault on the Paper-and-Air-Wave Curtain.

The August issue of *TMO* as well as the present one feature some of the responses. These letters are no more than a sampling of the hundreds of responses that started pouring in as soon as the July issue was released. Hundreds of encouraging messages have reached us by mail, cable, and telephone. Their common denominator is the conviction that a plan has been presented which, if executed, might make the essential difference. Among the messages there were some from spokesmen for various peace organizations; most, however, came from private individuals. The sincerity of these messages was often manifested by offers of help and support. Housewives offered to seek employment in order to donate their earnings for the projected daily. People in various income brackets wished to go on record pledging a percentage of their earnings to the alternative-newspaper. Many individuals, qualified to render skilled journalistic services, offered them without pay or in return for minimum subsistence wages. These included seasoned newspapermen, editors, photo-journalists, accountants, typists and others.

An interesting sidelight is thrown upon the frustration of American journalism as a profession. The messages we received from individuals employed by the press sounded apologetic. They expressed unhappiness for, as they put it, "having to" participate in a lie-industry which disgusts them. They welcomed as a personal salvation an opportunity to apply their knowledge to honest journalism. Among these individuals were reporters and writers whose readers would be shocked to learn that the distorting information and the reactionary opinions they read are often written by people who know better and regret "having to" meet publishers' "qualifications."

Another interesting sidelight is that many expressions of support came from rank-and-file members of organizations where no such enthusiasm was forthcoming from the organizations themselves. This demonstrates that at times the bureaucracy of liberal groups becomes so engrossed in self-serving projects as to be less sensitive to the actual needs of peace than are their rank-and-file members.

There are a number of organizations who are still weighing their position on the outlined alternative plan. It would therefore be premature to review the affirmative responses.

Not all responses, however, were affirmative. Those which were not, or those which were theoretically affirmative but in practical terms unconstructive, deserve scrutiny and rebuttal; and their authors should be called upon to re-consider their position.

With one conspicuous exception, virtually all the correspondents, whether individuals or spokesmen for organizations, agreed with the analysis as offered in "For an American Alternative." All except one conceded the existence of a Paper-and-Air-Wave Curtain in this country and conceived of it as the principal obstacle to reversing American global policies onto a peaceful course.

The sole dissenting voice in this regard deserves close attention. It came from the Executive Director of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (see "From Readers' Letters," August, 1961 issue of *TMO*). After emphasizing the personal nature of his response, Dr. Jack not only expressed doubts of the existence of a Paper-and-Air-Wave Curtain, but also unequivocally opposed cooperation with certain, unspecified but alluded-to American peace groups. This position is hardly a surprise. The recent history of certain American peace organizations amply testifies to a sense of values in which a "legitimate public image" takes precedence over their actual pursuit of peace. The degree to which certain liberal groups in America have assimilated the philosophy, once identified as "McCarthyism" (but which did not disappear with McCarthy), is a sad development indeed. Such groups feel that in order to avert damaging campaigns against them, they must make significant concessions to the political tastes of the crusaders of intolerance. This becomes their conjectured insurance policy for *organizational* survival. Whether they prosper, in the sense of gaining members and financial support, may depend on the attitude of the extreme right towards them rather than on the sincerity of their social purposes. They rationalize that it is necessary for them to make "a few" political compromises to save a "part" of their program. It is utterly unacceptable to them to open themselves to stigmatizing accusations of disloyalty from those who comb the country perpetually searching for forces and individuals to be wrapped in a political taboo.

Adapting themselves to the tastes of the fascist crusaders, the semi-liberal American movements in effect give to the extreme right the power to limit arbitrarily the political range between the American Right and Left. They bring about a social reality in which the McCarthy forces become the co-authors of the "liberal" programs. Were these forces to establish the advocacy of dropping nuclear bombs upon one country or another as the minimal expression of American "patriotism," the adaptable "liberal" groups would possibly believe themselves compelled to support this "patriotic

minimum." Through default of political integrity they bring about a reality in which they can be maneuvered into virtually any position prescribed by the crusaders of intolerance. The extent of their criticism and dissension depends less on their own analysis than on the forces they allegedly oppose.

Such political self-vindication and apologetics lead to internal purges. A man's identification with a specific program no longer suffices for acceptance of his support. What the Eastland-Walter-Hoover forces think of him becomes more important. If they depict him as "un-American," he becomes a liability to the organization no matter how sincerely he may be dedicated to its professed cause. Thus in effect the Eastlands run not only their own inquisitorial committees and vigilante agencies, but also the "liberal" groups.

That the forces of intolerance put up with any degree of dissension and opposition is hardly a concession on their part. On the contrary, as long as they succeed in depriving the "liberal" groups of intellectual independence and political integrity, they view them as an important extension of their own political crusades. Because, in effect, such groups become the *absorbers* and the *neutralizers* of potentially militant and radical opposition. They render the opposition controllable. They then fulfill a *diversionist* role not unlike the "radicalism" of the Moral Rearmament and the Atlantic Union "internationalists." They mislead thousands of concerned individuals and bring them back full circle to support NATO-type bellicosity. In this function these "liberal" groups reach elements who would never have directly followed the lead of war-mongers more candid or aware.

The single but important letter which without embarrassment admitted to "having hesitations to cooperate even for peace," is a part of this psychology. It will not be far-fetched to construe this confession as a preference *not* to serve peace rather than to serve it by cooperating with "undesirables."

While such groups may indeed be serving their institutional well-being, this kind of "success" is predicated on compromise of the very postulates on which they have emerged on the public scene. It would be naive to expect the war-mongers to sanction any truly effective peace activity.

Obviously, this analysis is not intended for flattery. It is highly possible that it will antagonize those of whom it speaks. Others who will accuse me of lack of diplomacy in this presentation will be perfectly right. There are, however, times and problems in which reality should not be distorted for considerations of public relations. Unless the political apologists within the liberal camp are ready for a revolutionary reversal of their motivational processes, their refusal to support the proposed alternative would be the only true service they could render to it. What is needed is not more emphasis on public relations, but an almost heroic self-search and an almost brutal honesty. The factors that could inspire the mental revolution are present: all that is needed is that these people attempt to assess honestly their present contribution to war prevention. If the facing of this issue does not awaken them, then false courtesy on our part certainly will not.

The responses of certain groups and individuals, who theoretically took an affirmative attitude towards our analysis can be categorized in two main groups: the "Yes-it's-true-but-we-can-do-nothing-about-it" category, and the "Yes-it's-true-and-the-plan-is-categorically-needed-but-

wait-a-minute-I-have-no-time-because-my-cake-is-burning-in-the-oven" group.

The pessimists, the most articulate of them being Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, acknowledge the correctness of the discernment of the Paper-and-Air-Wave Curtain. They also say that the projected program of action could make the difference, but they conclude that it "simply cannot be done." Dr. Hutchins finds it "hard to believe that a newspaper based on the appeal of peace would make the grade in a nation apparently devoted to entertainment and armament in equal measure" (TMO, August, 1961). The question is, whether this is a call to battle or a rationalization for inertia. If it is the latter, which indeed seems the case, one must ask what would have been the effect had the Founding Fathers heeded reality as they found it and resigned themselves to the undesirable because it seemed unalterable? If their determination and resolution sufficed to carve out from the mass of seeming impossibility these United States, why cannot the determination of men like Robert M. Hutchins suffice for as relatively modest an undertaking as the launching of an alternative newspaper in America?

I fully agree with Dr. Hutchins that, were we to depend for initiative on those "devoted to entertainment and armament in equal measure," we could not expect the realization of the plan. I am, however, in the fortunate situation of knowing of one man (in fact quite a few men) who is not "devoted to entertainment and armament in equal measure." The exact opposite is true of this man: Robert M. Hutchins. The question is, what he and men like him are ready and inspired to do. Or, are they ready?

The program outlined in "For an American Alternative" was not presented as an exercise in materialistic dialectic. Whether what is presented as *possible* will become actual depends on the resolution of men, not all men, but those most likely to respond and those believing that the outlined plan, if pursued, could provide a National Alternative.

My optimism is certainly not so extreme as to contend that the launching of a progressive daily newspaper would necessarily save the world from war. But I do contend that this would be the *minimal* activity that would have a chance of becoming effective. The fact that previous attempts at launching a progressive daily have failed may or may not indicate that it couldn't be done, but it certainly does not reduce the means required to cause some reversal in this country. The unavailability of bulldozers does not indicate the potential strength of a tea spoon to lift a mountain. If we are incapable of producing the minimal means, why keep sacrificing for means that definitely have no chance of making the difference? I do not invite pessimism, but I do believe that as long as there is something within us that makes us rebel against what is going on, our first responsibility is for the effectiveness of our deeds. So inspired and so responsible, we may well stretch the limits of the possible.

Could it be that the role of the critic in America has become so taxing, tiresome and frustrating that no vigor is left in him to devote himself to the things that could make the difference? Are we so tired as no longer to possess the stamina to apply ourselves to very difficult tasks even when they alone bear the promise of success?

I pose these questions without any presumptions. Neither a negative nor a positive answer would surprise me. But the answer must be given with perfect honesty so as to provide those concerned with a realistic perspective of our function in a world at danger.

A more upsetting reaction came from those circles who, fully agreeing with the discernment of the Paper-and-Air-Wave Curtain as well as with the practicality of the outlined alternative,

find themselves "too busy" to give the matter urgent and overriding consideration. These are groups totally absorbed in their own pet projects. Some of them have long since lost sight of what is needed to weigh in the balance of war and peace. They have developed something of a sentimental attachment to and provincial narrowness within their organizational framework. As well-intentioned as these people are, they have found in their activity a social environment that imposes upon them quite rigid personal traditions. In this process of "socializing," the main external goal often becomes obscured. Or, rationalizations are born, which with thin logic, relate the sentimental involvement to an effective service for the overall external goal. It is little surprising, therefore, that the serving of the "Alternative Plan" is neglected in favor of some routine mailing, or a daily concern with raising small operational funds, or a "need" — never questioned — to continue some relatively insignificant pet project.

At times the social environment of such groups becomes their particular mental suburbia, fully equipped with its own brand of snobbishness and mental compensations. Typically, in reaction to a talk I delivered on the "American Alternative," one group indulged in something of a contest of intermural flattery about the "great" job being done by one member or another. As if they had actually secured peace on earth . . . To the credit of that group, I must mention that others of its members have displayed a better sense of proportion and a greater degree of relevance.

At times one appears before such groups as an "outside applicant." No matter how convincing the program he presents, no matter how much verbal support it elicits, the program is

seen as "his" program in contrast to "their" program. There is even a pride and jealousy of sponsorship involved. It is as if one were told: "Well and good, but you peddle your program and we will keep peddling ours." And the life of the little bureaucracy returns to "normal" . . .

If these groups constantly hold before their eyes the paramount goal of averting war; if they consider every minute that nothing short of achieving this goal will do, the great discrepancy between their verbal goals and practical lethargy will cease to exist.

It is encouraging, however, that in each of these groups a single determined individual would suffice to snap the others out of their little dream world. This presentation is indeed intended to invigorate such lone wolves to in turn invigorate the others.

To conclude this incomplete report, it is important to state that enough interest has been generated by the plan for a National Alternative to continue efforts to enroll further support for the necessary initial steps. As of this moment, however, the project has not yet aroused enough support to proceed to the stage of preliminary execution. I am far from being certain that it will be executed. I am, however, confident that it *can* be executed. The endorsement and pledge of personal involvement on the part of such individuals as Ava Helen Pauling and Linus Pauling lend the project desired stature. Its fate depends solely on those groups and individuals who have pledged themselves to work for peace. There can be no passing of the buck; the possibilities and the impossibilities are strictly properties of the mind. It is up to the peace devotees to act. The responsibility is theirs. This responsibility they can rationalize out of existence, but not escape.

#### *An Answer to "What Can I Do?"*

## For Political Information Committees

By Annot Jacobi and Louise Samoiloff

We have received a communication, telling us about a highly effective project of political education. The project is conducted in Long Island, N. Y. We believe it to be an example of what concerned individuals can do virtually single-handed to counteract the suffocating conformity of our society, a conformity which may ultimately result in disaster to all mankind. Mesdames Jacobi's and Samoiloff's project is the more realistic because it is conducted on the community level and requires relatively small financial means. We reproduce their communication in the hope that it will encourage other individuals to undertake similar projects in their communities. In particular we wish to encourage our friends to use such projects for introducing copies of *The Minority of One*. For this purpose we are making bulk shipments of copies of back issues available at the nominal charge of \$15 per 100 copies.

—Ed.

The most effective curb to the prevailing threat of war would be a politically informed public.

It is not necessarily true that the American people are politically indifferent and apathetic. Contentions to this effect may well stem from the fact that so many Americans are unaware of the dangers of the present world situation or of the fact that these dangers can be counteracted. Most people read no more than daily newspapers, and from them it is virtually impossible to gain a true picture of the world problems. The few liberal weeklies and monthlies that are published in America have a small circulation and usually get into the hands of those already well informed.

Most people, however, like to receive mail. In every household there is at least one person who reads literature received by mail. It therefore seems to us that if we could spread some of the excellent literature that although published does not reach the general public, we would be helping to create a new political climate in this country.

To organize such an activity is a relatively simple project. In our town of Huntington, for

instance, there is a population of about 100,000. Counting on an average of four to a family, 25,000 households need to be reached. If we could mail to each of them selected literature each month for 4-6 months, this would surely have an effect upon them and gradually build here a body of informed opinion. While our financial means do not enable us at this time to start with mailings of 25,000, we do retain this figure as our goal. We shall start with mailings of 1,000 and build up from there. Inserted in each mailing will be an appeal for financial support of the project, which allows us to hope for a snowballing effect. We shall also ask the mail recipients to pass on the literature, which will further increase the circulation.

We hope that also others throughout the country will find this activity worth trying. Many people ask: "What can I do?" Many liberals are defeated by frustration and a feeling of helplessness. The project here outlined may relieve many such people of their frustration; it is one that can be carried out even by a single individual and even in a small village.

At the Vienna Conference of President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev on June 4, 1961, the Soviet leader handed the President a note which stated, according to the *New York Times* of July 8 "that unless there was a settlement of the German problem by the end of the year, including the conversion of West Berlin into a 'demilitarized free city' the Soviet Union would sign a peace treaty with Communist East Germany and turn over to East Germany the control of access to West Berlin."

This demand on the part of Khrushchev is not new. On November 3, 1958, he announced that the time had come "to give up the remnants of the occupation regime in Berlin" and called upon the Western powers "to establish their own relations with the German Democratic Republic and come to an agreement with it . . ." He indicated that the West had made of Berlin a "state within a state" and was using it as "a base for subversive activity against East Germany and Russia." He went on to say that the Western powers enjoy the right of "unhampered communication" between West Germany and West Berlin over a territory whose government they do not even recognize. Finally, he made it clear that if anyone attacks East Germany, the U.S.S.R. "will consider it as an attack on the Soviet Union . . ." He set the end of May, 1959, or roughly six months, as a deadline for action.

The six-month deadline arrived and a crisis was averted. Some say Mr. Khrushchev backed down, but a more reasonable interpretation is that there was hope of a summit meeting between President Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev. A visit between the two took place in the United States, a discussion of Berlin was held and, according to various reports, some hope was held out that negotiations on Berlin might take place. Later came pressure from West German Chancellor Adenauer, the U-2 spy plane incident, the abortive summit meeting in Europe, and the worsening of the international scene.

After the summit failure and in view of the election of a new President, Khrushchev stated that he would wait until the new administration had an opportunity to get well under way.

Prior to the June 4, 1961, memorandum, President Kennedy canvassed America's allies in Europe and appointed former Secretary of State Dean Acheson to do the canvassing and make a study of the situation. Acheson, according to a June 1, 1961, *New York Times* report, recommended to President deGaulle that the North Atlantic nations be placed on an emergency basis and a U.S.-British-French military task force be ready to convoy supplies through the East-West check point at Helmstadt. In this fashion, the U.S., instead of using the available time since 1958 for a study of new negotiating positions that might solve the problem of Berlin and Germany, has come up with a last-minute military threat.

On June 15, the East German Communist leader, Walter Ulbricht, announced that his government wanted "full control of all traffic on land, on water and in the air" and urged the Western Allies to negotiate their rights of access to Berlin with East Germany "if they do not want traffic to be interrupted."

### LONGER-TERM BACKGROUND

At the Moscow Conference in October, 1943, Britain, Russia, and the United States agreed on joint occupation of Germany and set up a joint European Advisory Commission. This Commission agreed in November, 1944, on a system of zones proposed by the Soviets, and on a system of control machinery for Germany with each Commander in Chief in charge of his zone.

At this time the State Department position was one of wanting guaranteed access to Berlin by land. The military, however, did the actual deciding and had a veto over the State Department. The U.S. military felt its superiority over the Russians and did not believe a signed written agreement was necessary. So the military planners insisted that the problem of access be left for settlement at the military level. It was thus the American military which was responsible for the first serious problems over Berlin, resulting in no legal agreement for assured access to Berlin by land. (The U.S., however, did insist on a written guarantee from the British for free access from the North German ports in the British zone to the American zone of occupation!)

At this time Russia apparently had no intention to incorporate Berlin into the Soviet Union's control since it rejected a U.S. request to feed Berlin and thus put it under Russia's economic control.

The United States was not prepared to press for constructive agreements on social and economic matters because the War Department supported the vengeful Morgenthau plan against a more moderate line advocated by the State Department. President Roosevelt, apparently as a result of this controversy, issued a directive which forbade any policy settlements over Germany in the end of 1944. Thus when Germany surrendered in May, 1945, there was uncertainty among the great powers as to their policy.

It was at Yalta in 1945 that Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin agreed on the zones of occupation of Germany with an Allied Control Commission in Berlin to govern all of Germany as an economic and political

Dr. John Swomley, Jr. is Associate Professor of Social Ethics and Philosophy at the Saint Paul School of Theology in Kansas City, Mo. He is the author of several volumes, including "America, Russia and the Bomb" and "The Road to War."

## Berlin: Background

By John Swomley, Jr.

unit. Stalin later agreed to have the French become a part of this Control Commission and have a zone taken from the original American zone. Berlin was to be occupied by all four powers and divided into four sectors.

At Yalta it was agreed to let Russia have a part of eastern Poland and eastern Prussia (Germany) with Poland being compensated for its loss to Russia by getting what was left of Germany east of the Oder-Neisse rivers.

The next series of moves that complicated the Berlin and German picture were made by the French. Since at Potsdam it was agreed that the Allied Control Council should operate on a basis of unanimous decisions, France was able petulantly to veto the setting up of all-German political parties, nation-wide labor unions, and other items which would have made it difficult if not impossible later for East and West Germany to have developed as separate units as they have today. Russia in 1946 and the U.S. in 1947 also violated the Potsdam agreement and it largely lost its validity. (James Warburg, *Berlin: Background and Future*.)

Another major Western post-war mistake was made when the three Western nations decided to combine their zones into what became later a West German Republic. "The West," according to one authority, "had come to fear that a unified Germany would permit the Soviets to extend their control over all of Germany. The Soviets, at that time, were still genuinely interested in German unity . . ." (Carter, Ranney, Herz, *Major Foreign Powers*, p. 646) The West wanted to establish in Germany a western type of democracy in a decentralized loose federal system, whereas the Soviet Union wanted a centralized government with a central police force along the lines of the system later developed in East Germany.

This Western action resulted in the creation of an East German regime and eventually an attempt by the Russians to put the West out of Berlin on the ground that Germany was no longer one unit and four-power government had in fact ceased to exist. The Berlin blockade and airlift in 1948-1949 followed and in 1949 was resolved by another agreement.

Following the formation of West and East Germany, the Russians set up some para-military groups in East Germany and in September, 1950, Secretary of State Dean Acheson demanded that West Germany be rearmed. The decision to rearm was made and later, after West Germany became an independent republic in 1955, it became a member of NATO.

One reason for Russian urgency in demanding a solution to the German problem is the rearmament of Germany by the United States. Russia fears that an armed West Germany, especially if armed with nuclear weapons as has been proposed in some quarters, might some day precipitate a war in order to regain former German territory now in the hands of Russia and Poland.

### CORE OF THE PROBLEM

The United States claims that the unification of Germany is the first and necessary step to the solution of the Berlin crisis. At the same time, however, it is unwilling for West Germany to give up membership in NATO. This means that if Russia were to consent to unification, she would in effect be agreeing to East Germany becoming a part of an anti-Soviet military alliance under American leadership. This is a proposal we know the Russians cannot accept and is therefore not a serious negotiating position.

If Germany is to be unified, it obviously must be done in such a way as not to add West Germany to the Soviet side or East Germany to the American side — in other words, some type of neutral status is necessary. One possible pattern for such a proposal is the successful treaty neutralizing Austria; it resulted in a withdrawal of both Russian and American troops.

For this reason a number of statesmen including George F. Kennan of the United States and Hugh Gaitskill of the British Labor Party have endorsed a proposal that would result in withdrawal of Russian and Western troops from Germany and certain other countries. One such proposal made by Adam Rapacki, Polish Foreign Minister, on October 2, 1957, was for a zone of Poland, Czechoslovakia, West and

# Kind of a Crisis

of this  
American  
ed into  
Poland  
ed for  
of the  
German  
ed that  
nous  
of all-  
items  
ast and  
today.  
agreements  
Back-  
en the  
became  
uthority,  
Soviets  
t time,  
tanney,  
tablish  
loose  
govern-  
n later  
German  
est out  
uit and  
ockade  
another  
ssians  
ember,  
Germany  
er West  
member  
to the  
States.  
d with  
t some  
ry now  
is the  
At the  
ive up  
sent to  
coming  
ership.  
erefore  
such a  
Germany  
tatus is  
cessful  
Russian  
Kennan  
Party  
ussian  
. One  
er, on  
est and

East Germany, from which nuclear weapons would be barred. In February, 1958, the Soviet Union not only backed this proposal but offered to discuss reduction of foreign troops and conventional armaments in the zone. It agreed in principle to the idea of control and inspection in the zone. U.S. military leaders opposed the proposal because they felt U.S. troops and installations in Germany were the key to NATO and withdrawal from Germany would lead to abandonment of NATO and withdrawal from Europe.

If U.S. policy is indefinitely to be one of rearming West Germany and maintaining a military alliance with West Germany, then we should recognize that there is no hope of unification. This means either that we continue the present cold war with recurring crises over Germany or that we accept some stabilization of the post-war power situation. The apparent aims of Soviet policy now are to seek formal recognition by the U.S. of the Oder-Neisse line and of the East German state, and thus to acknowledge legally what already exists in fact. This seems to be the real object of the present Berlin crisis. Walter Lippman, after his interview with Khrushchev, stated that "More than anything else" Mr. Khrushchev "wants to give legal status to the East German state." Mr. Khrushchev's reason apparently is to get American and West German recognition of the status quo and current boundaries of Germany, Poland, and Russia in the hope that this will remove the danger of war to change these boundaries.

If we look only at the Berlin situation, we need to recognize the weaknesses as well as the strength of the Western right to be in Berlin. Legally none of the wartime or post-war agreements make West Berlin a part of West Germany, nor give the West the responsibility or right to supply the civilian population of West Berlin. We have only the right to maintain a garrison and have access to the city. We have, however, established the precedent for supplying West Berlin.

## THE PRESENT CRISIS

The Russian proposal to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany would inevitably either force the U.S. to deal with and hence recognize East Germany in order to be sure of access to Berlin, or else it would result in our ignoring East Germany on a diplomatic level and using military means if necessary to gain access to Berlin.

Insofar as the Russians are ready to ask for a unilateral peace treaty with East Germany, they are doing what the United States did in signing a separate peace treaty with Japan over Russian objections. The issue is therefore not a moral one in the sense that the Russians want to do something we haven't done or wouldn't do if it were to our advantage. The real issue is one of conflict of interests.

The present crisis arises not only from a renewed demand by the Russians for a settlement of the German problem but from the American response to that problem. This response has been essentially a military one, in which the Kennedy administration under strong Pentagon influence is either using a "brink of war" threat or actually plans to go to war. The ominous signs include the canvassing of allies about armed action, the unwillingness to come up with any reasonable alternative, the recent ascendancy in the White House of General Maxwell Taylor who was the first U. S. military commander in Berlin and who believes the Soviet Union can be fought on the ground in Europe, the decision by Republican Senators to avoid partisan comment, the Kennedy conflict with Under Secretary of State Bowles who in general is an advocate of a less militaristic policy, the plans for and talk of mobilization and declaration of a national emergency.

One difficulty in all of this is that each side expects the other to back down. We are, as C. L. Sulzberger of THE NEW YORK TIMES put it, like two juveniles "driving two motor cars head on at each other to see which driver flinches first . . . This kind of strategy may be suitable to poker but it is scarcely wise . . . when the onrushing automobiles are filled with H-bombs."

## OTHER FACTORS THAN THE CRISIS ITSELF

One little-noticed aspect of this crisis is the fact that it provides a convenient excuse for certain vested interests to achieve what would otherwise have been impossible. For example, the NEW YORK TIMES of June 10 reported that the Army would seek more men on active

and reserve duty. "The Army thus placed itself in public opposition to the Defense Department and probably opened a fight within the Pentagon and Congress over Army manpower strength. Only this week Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell L. Gilpatric told a news conference that the Army would not need an increase in its present 875,000-man strength because of the increased mobilization readiness planned for its Reserve . . ."

But, on July 11, the NEW YORK TIMES reported that a Defense Department review was under way which could lead to further increase in the defense budget. On July 12, the NEW YORK TIMES announced that the Pentagon was weighing a call-up of Reserves.

On July 13, the NEW YORK TIMES reported that the Air Force was preparing a vigorous appeal to Congress for more bombers in spite of a previous decision by the Secretary of Defense advising against it.

Civil Defense is asking Congress for an increase from 100 million dollars to 300 million.

On July 17, the NEW YORK TIMES stated in a news report from Washington, which mentioned the reporter's conference with Pentagon officials, that "Any mobilization of reserves would be intended here as but one of a series of measures to alert the American people to the seriousness of international affairs. However, mobilization would have a practical purpose too."

In other words, the American people need to be "educated" by the military!

The military has certainly had a strong hand in shaping American response to the present crisis. THE NEW YORK TIMES of July 12 reported that Deputy Secretary of Defense Gilpatric said that the President had received many proposals for dealing with the Berlin situation, including various ones from the Pentagon. "These proposals, he said, were narrowed down to certain specific possible courses of action at a week-end conference of the President, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Mr. McNamara (Secretary of Defense) and General Maxwell D. Taylor, the White House military representative.

"The Pentagon's assignment now, Mr. Gilpatric continued, is for the Joint Chiefs and the service secretaries to determine whether the existing force structure would permit adoption of favored plans; and what new demands, particularly in defense appropriations, must be made upon Congress."

In the press there has hardly been any mention of the impact of greater appropriations and a call-up of reserves on the present high level of unemployment which the present administration has been unable to solve by other means.

But the NEW YORK TIMES in its July 17 issue revealed that "the Department of Labor has carried out since the days of the Eisenhower Administration, a campaign to educate employers throughout the United States about the possibilities of a mobilization." Evidently the Kennedy Administration was thinking of possible military mobilization long before the present crisis developed.

Whether or not this crisis is an opportunity certain vested interests have been looking for, it does seem to this writer as if the current military aspect of the crisis has an artificial tone to it. Meanwhile American mobilization looks dangerous to the rest of the world, as if American military leaders may be eager for a showdown, even if it means nuclear holocaust. In any event, as the French have pointed out, "the use of an Allied armed convoy would be interpreted by the world as the first act of war . . ." (June 1, 1961, NEW YORK TIMES, James Reston column) In other words, it would be aggression by the West for invading East Germany.

## SOME QUESTIONS

Why does the United States persist in always letting the Russians seize the initiative? Why is our response always or chiefly the military one? If the present division of Germany is to our liking, why not accept *de jure* what we have accepted *de facto*? This in itself would solve much if not all of the present crisis. If we don't like the present division, why don't we propose our own solution, but one that might be acceptable to Russia and the two Germanies as well?

Until intelligent civil diplomacy supersedes military considerations in Washington it may be that our only hope of averting the logic of our military policy is to insist on placing the controversy in the lap of the United Nations and our hope for world peace in the hands of the nations not directly involved in Berlin.

In the meantime there are some forces in the Senate who thus far have seemed reluctant to write Kennedy and the Pentagon a blank check. Among these appear to be Senator William Fulbright, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Majority Leader Mike Mansfield; Wayne Morse; possibly Hubert Humphrey, as well as others. Their hands could be strengthened and some vocal leadership encouraged by a flood of mail to each Senator.

In any event the destruction of nuclear war would be so great and the likelihood of an initial limited war expanding into nuclear war so real that concerned Americans should not take a chance on the Russians backing down nor on America getting so far out on the limb that we can't adopt any other alternative than a course that might result in the destruction of Western Europe, Russia, and ourselves as well.

# The Gratuitous Grotesque

By Mary Graham Lund

Seldom, except in the occasional lyrics of Stephen Crane, has the grotesque appeared in American poetry. Yet the idea of the "lyric as emotion" which stems from Horace and Proclus in the Aristotelian tradition, does admit humor to its province. According to Louis Armand Reid (*A Study in Aesthetics*, 1931) "strong humor" adds width to the "difficult beauty" of the lyric. Much of the poetry of James Franklin Lewis has been misunderstood by his editors and belittled by his critics because in him the "spirit of lyric" was enhanced by the spontaneous, the gratuitous, the explosive, the curative grotesque.

Humor in Lewis's poetry is never contrived. It is a product of the essential "joy of the spirit" which characterized the "Renaissance man," the "universal man," at home in two worlds, the objective world of science and the subjective realm of the lyric. Lewis did not force wit. His humor was a part of what Germany's great modern poet Gottfried Benn calls the *Vorgang*, the event of the poem which exists before it is translated into words.

Lewis had never heard of Benn, but his explanation of *Vorgang* is clear and credible. "Sometimes," he wrote to his editor, Dr. Alan Swallow, "a poem comes to me in musical melody which I cannot transmit by word of page. Quite often I start off well with a line, a melody, or an idea, work fluently for a half hour, get stalled completely, lay it in my box of attempts, stall again, and again — then find my mind full of melody." These diatonic melodies, the poet explains, "have exactly the same curve as the verbal melody that emerges."

As examples of this type of *Vorgang* Lewis offers two poems in *Score for this Watch*\* (Swallow Press, 1941). In "Midair Metabolism," the opening poem, there is a comparison of a fountain's play with water — droplets forever bursting into beauty to return "In the insubstantial way/Of a waterstalk that flows like a poet's pen/To fill an oblivious rock-strewn gorge./Unstably as the course of men . . ." which has elements of the grotesque. "Excavators," an account of an amateur geological jaunt, is sprinkled with chips of macabre humor, such as, "We found a curving reddish trail/That might have been another bone/Gone to decompose alone." It has a merry rhythm that counterpoints the macabre theme ironically. These two poems, he confessed, were constructed upon a melody and "taken out of a white-hot head in a very few minutes."

This was not true of "To a Mocking Bird," an arrangement in all its seventeen stanzas, not so much of the bird's song as of the poet's emotions, as the passionate bird flings its contradictions into space, jovially antagonistic to everything in general. Lewis confessed that he "painfully worked out the meter and content over a number of months," though in the end he "dashed off the whole business in a few intense hours." This is an example of "Pre-Set," a process of selecting the components according to the effects desired in advance of actual composition, a term and process applicable to the kinetic as well as to the plastic arts. In this case, he set up a formal stanza pattern, then structured the poem carefully from the personal and concrete to the universal concrete.

Mary Graham Lund is a poetess and a literary critic. She is presently engaged in sorting and marketing the unpublished manuscripts of James Franklin Lewis.

\*Copies of *Score for this Watch* are available from the poet's widow, Mrs. James Franklin Lewis, 4420 McCulloch St., Duluth 4, Minn., at \$1.00.

This poem is like Shelley at his Hellenic best; the last stanza even carries a Shelleyan lament at the transience of fame:

And all the signatures of men and birds  
Are intervals that cross the air  
Untenably with impious words  
Too beautiful to bear;  
Revaluations,  
Wild elations,  
Hymns of nations,  
Lightheartedly they dissipate in space,  
Inconsonant with place,  
Like perfume past a face.

The grotesque in "Mocking Bird" consists mainly in regarding the bird as an orator against "old dotards bent on laws," "air stuffy with old sound," — against waste, and bad taste, etc. The grotesque persists in his serious poems. In "Time at Trial" he brings up the subject of gargoyles:

Coiners of the future—and each an appliance  
Of the hope-front—holding their wind-tent  
hats  
Among impish rocketing shreds of torn news  
And wronged leaves hear in vain the porridge  
filth  
Gurgling under sewer-hatches its rushed  
curds.

The grotesque is as much a part of a serious poem as the gargoyles of Gothic architecture; they serve the same purpose as those famous waterspouts in washing away filth and debris.

Things speak to Lewis humorously: "the pewter plate has a round low base"; "squeak-fitted feet" call out for pity as they tiptoe the street; the grass in the rain calls out "a saturate peace"; the poet listens to "a city of sifting poetries." Things do the strangest things: fairies "strop their silky wings on the metaphysical rose"; "some moon has grown/To a great self-love in the local sky"; a serpent "rolls to a marriage-hoop"; man escaping from a lost civilization saves "a wattled cockatrice and a catalogue of Greece."

Lewis's view of a distorted universe is highly serious: he battles against ambivalence (which seems to be a holy symbol in much modern literature) considering it the poet's task to integrate it, since all things are really polar. In one of his most serious efforts titled "The Annual Poem," there are several grotesque images. In this poem Lewis celebrates the tree-god of Christianity, the trinity of branches. As the keystone of the Christian philosophy is sacrifice, the tree drops its "fair mass of shredded yellow downward/Into dusky gossip—." Man makes foolish use of the sacrifice, so that the tree god is forced to "abdicate his own creation," to become the wild blasphemer of later centuries, the agnostic trinity of science. The tree becomes weary of the slow advance of reason, weary of the "wind's interrupting thuds," of the "deferred poison" in its veins, pessimistic of the new growth from the spicy decay below — "Kept leaves like Christmas bushels of old letters stank . . ." But these dead leaves — ". . . trophies from the dry tripartite peace," the poet warns, must be treated as though their minds were still alive — "Fallen as they are now in their mockery/Of democracy, all fallen — dead instruments/In transit to experiment again/(In faint ammonia under memory-meadows) . . ." The scientist must again begin his search for truth, but "The wrecked log/Lays its long trash across the path, /To trip up Jack running around with a light-bulb/Through the hollows . . ."

Lewis saw life with a cartoonist's eye. Evidence of this is found repeatedly in an early poem *Lem Harris in Illinois*, an account of a rather frustrating year at a small denominational college, particularly in his descriptions of characters. "One smiled a sweet expanse of resignation," another wore a "face impressed by truth and money-lenders." The president was a "man of great theologies and reasons/That shifted with the seasons," and while he talked "the faculty sat there dead/And watched the indentations in his head." One of the faculty was a lonely fellow, "hounded by suspicion/With much saliva and a fake contrition." One of the feminine members of the staff "loved her words to being through rounded lips/Slowly mothered to enunciation." And one of the faculty wives was "over-childed, overmastered, underfed."

The Disneyish cartoonist's trick of using animals to point a moral, Lewis carried to an hilarious extreme in a long unpublished poem titled *Goat's Milk and Mirrors*. In excerpts published in *Targets 5* ("Hot Spots" and "Strange Epitaph") the protagonist sees 1) "four-winged birds" sitting on a wire, 2) "a headless hen/Leaping in ecstasy . . ." and 3) a stool which ". . . committed nuisance/On the letters of a solemn epitaph,/Yellowly bathing that fiction/In the salty stream of reality . . ." This book with the intriguing title may well prove the most exciting of all of Lewis's work. I have seen only Part I, *Esthetics* (40 pages) and Part III, *Socialics* (35 pages). Mrs. Lewis wrote me (Jan. 4, 1961) that in the box of unfinished manuscripts she has recently discovered a copy of *Esthetics* labeled Part II, and Part I (not typed) titled *Philosophics*. Part I contains about 36 pages, and there is a prose introduction of 26 pages. The epigraph of the book is a quotation from Schleimacher:

"Therefore my progress is slow, and I shall have to live long before I have embraced all things equally, but whatever I do embrace will bear my impress."

Lewis did not live long. He died at the age of 42, in his laboratory, with an unfinished poem on his desk, over four thousand pages of unpublished work in "The Box," and a book ready for the printer. The book is *The Apocalypse of Harmony*, the title poem of which was recently given a cash award by THE CAROLINA QUARTERLY. The poem appears, for the first time in English, in their summer issue. It was published in Spanish translation in RUECA, a magazine published in Mexico City. Lewis was a great admirer of modern Spanish poetry, and acquainted with the work of the Mexican poets Huerta and Paz, a fact which he reveals in an article in INTERIM the fall of 1944.

Lewis was becoming interested in philosophy, and might have bogged down in a morass of Hegelian dialectic had it not been for his flair for the grotesque, the mischievous spirit that made him place gargoyles on all his temples. It seems probable that he had put away *Goat's Milk* to work on a series of philosophic poems titled *The Stepholds of the Mind*, published posthumously in *The University of Kansas City Review* (Winter, 1946). But he couldn't shut out the leprechaun. He says, regretfully, of science, "I've spent a half a life in this love-pact,/Darting about my coat-tails,/Striving to be accurate and wise." But he was wiser, perhaps, in *Goat's Milk*. The leprechaun's voice may prove louder than Hegel's.

Alliance for Progress?

# The (German-American) Fascist International

By Georg Herde

While flaunting democratic slogans during election campaigns, many American Senators and Congressmen are strange bed fellows of Neo-Nazi leaders when visiting West Germany. Making common cause with former Nazi officers, they lend active support to undisguised revanchist movements in West Germany. The following account is strange and sad, and, unfortunately, it is also true.

—Ed.

Czechoslovakia was one of the first nations victims of Hitler's aggressions in Europe. As soon as Hitler ascended to power in Germany, in 1933, his faithful disciple, Konrad Henlein, organized the "Sudeten German Party." This was in effect a branch of the National-Socialist Party on Czech soil, and it fulfilled an infamous role in precipitating the annexation of the Sudeten region by Hitler Germany, and in the eventual decline of the Czechoslovak state.

It could not be expected that a revived post-war Czechoslovakia would remain indifferent towards her home-grown Nazis. The Potsdam Agreement, signed on August 2, 1945 by President Harry S. Truman, Prime Minister Clement R. Attlee and Marshal Joseph W. Stalin, addressed itself to that vital problem; and its Section XIII called for the transfer of the German population living in Czechoslovakia to Germany.

It did not take long until the expellees started sensing the unique political opportunity accorded them by the East-European policies of Chancellor Adenauer's Government and those of the NATO allies. As soon after World War II as 1948, the German expellees from Czechoslovakia started forming a distinct political movement, whose main characteristics were closely reminiscent of Henlein's party. The spirit and the goals of the movement are virtually the same as those that were pursued by the Nazi Fifth Column preceding the Disgrace of Munich. Hitler's assignment to Henlein outlived both; and their political disciples are determined once more to bring about the decline of Czechoslovakia. Former leading National-Socialists and SS officers organized the "Sudeten German Landsmannschaft," employing an understandable home nostalgia of the expellees for devious political ends of the cold war.

The biographies of virtually all of the "Landsmannschaft's" leaders in themselves constitute quite a chapter in Nazi history. The list of present leaders who in days past were Nazi leaders seems endless. Some of them, in addition to the sad consistency of their political career during and after the Nazi era, also occupy important official positions in West Germany. The speaker of the "Sudeten German Landsmannschaft" is Federal Minister Dr. Hans-Christoph Seehoem, who, during the Nazi period, became the chairman of the Colliery A.G. complex of Czechoslovakia, after the "aryanization", or the elimination of the Jewish owners, from the company. The federal chairman of the Landsmannschaft is Dr. Franz Boehm, former head of the NSDAP District Court in Sudeten. The long list of such leaders includes Franz Karmasin, formerly Konrad Henlein's deputy, head of the NSDAP in Slovakia and secretary of the fascist government of Tiso.

These same individuals and other leaders of the Landsmannschaft, a list of whom would be too long to include here, prepared Hitler's in-

vasion of Czechoslovakia. They are responsible for the unspeakable wave of terror that swept that unfortunate country. They carried on the anti-Semitic campaign that culminated in the extermination of Jews and those gentiles who dared to oppose Hitler. Today virtually all leading figures in Nazi activities find a political refuge and forum in the "Sudeten German Landsmannschaft." In no other post-war German organization have Nazi leaders come to the foreground en masse as they have in the Landsmannschaft. It is there that they are reviving German territorial demands in East and Southeast Europe. It speaks well of the majority of West Germans that they are not attracted to the Landsmannschaft. Yet the potential danger these revanchists pose may not be underestimated.

The "Sudeten German Landsmannschaft" holds annual festivals intended to keep the hatred of Czechoslovakia alive among the expellees. This year the festival, called the "Sudeten German Day," was held in Cologne, May 19-22. Were it not for a slight change of symbols, the festival could have been taken for a typical martial Nazi rally. DER SPIEGEL, a news magazine published in Hamburg, gave a vivid description of the event: "Sounds of fanfares, rolls of the drums, equal step: the Sudeten-German youth is marching. Their uniform: grey. Their flag: black-red-black. Their field-badge: the arrow rune."

To ensure the "success" of the "Sudeten German Day, 1961", the Landsmannschaft dispatched its Secretary-General, Walter Becher, who is also the leader of the Bavarian All-German Party, to the United States. He arrived in the U.S. in the beginning of May. With the Eichmann trial proceeding in Jerusalem and with warnings appearing in the more responsible West German press (such as DIE WELT of Hamburg and FRANFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG) that the Nazi type slogans and activities of the Landsmannschaft may undermine the Western Allies' trust in the German Federal Republic, it seemed that Becher's mission was headed for failure. The more so since Becher personally was a live testimony to the Nazi character of the organization he represented. He was a leading Henlein Nazi and a co-editor of the Nazi journal in the Sudeten region, DIE ZERR. In that position he carried on a vicious anti-Semitic campaign second only to those of Rosenberg and Streicher.

Yet, the unbelievable happened: Becher was received by many American politicians with open arms and friendly outpourings. He succeeded in soliciting congratulatory telegrams to the "Sudeten German Day" festivities from more than sixty members of the U. S. Congress. A few quotes from some of the cables will suffice to convey the deep sense of identification with which they were dispatched. Rep. Charles S. Gubser from California cabled: "I think that the spirit animating the Sudeten German Day is the greatest hope for the free world." Rep. D. R. (Billy) Matthew of Florida pretended to speak for all of America: "You may rest assured, that our beloved nation stands by in your struggle for your former homeland one

hundred per cent." Other messages were received from Senators Barry M. Goldwater, Herman E. Talmadge, Karl E. Mundt, Thomas J. Dodd, J. Strom Thurmond, Andrew F. Schoepel, Wallace F. Bennett, and Thurston B. Morton as well as from Congressmen Don L. Short, Otto E. Passman, W. R. Poage, Joseph P. Addabbo, Philip J. Philbin, James C. Davis, Frank J. Becker, James C. Auchincloss, John H. Rousselot, and James B. Utt.

The spectacular success of Becher's mission culminated in the presence of American Congressmen on the Sudeten German Day. Congressmen Morgan M. Moulder, Gordon H. Scherer, Henry C. Shadberg and Roy A. Taylor came to Germany and actually participated in the festivities. Hitler's and Henlein's politicians met with American politicians on the common ground of militant anti-Communism. The violent anti-Semitism and opposition to anything democratic on the part of the German colleagues did not hinder the American colleagues from demonstrating and pronouncing a common cause with them. Addressing the assembly, Representative Henry C. Shadberg stated that "the freedom-loving people of America and all over the world value your attitude." Rep. Morgan M. Moulder seconded him with a pompous manifesto: "Make this Sudeten German Day, 1961 a turning-point in our common struggle for freedom of all peoples. The Sudeten German expellees are allies of the conservative anti-Communist forces in the free world." Rep. Gordon H. Scherer was concerned with the practical aspect of the Neo-Nazi activities: "We have a common goal . . . anti-Communist organizations like yours and those in the United States should get more money . . ." and, to boost that recommended flow of money, he bestowed political respectability upon the gathering: "You have won the admiration of all countries owing to your actions."

Among the guests of the occasion were such men as the former ministers in the fascist Tiso government in Slovakia, Durcanski and Tiso. In their heydays they hardly imagined they ever would hear such compliments from American spokesmen.

The Sudeten German Landsmannschaft gives an annual award, the "Sudeten German Prize of Charles IV." This year it went to Philip A. Hrobak, president of the "Slovak League" of America. There could hardly be a more apt laureate to symbolize all the Landsmannschaft stands for. The Slovak-born Hrobak was one of the most important liaison-agents of the Hlinka-Tiso regime of Slovakia, operating in the United States from 1939 to 1945. He was the spokesman of a regime which wiped out virtually all the Jews of Slovakia. His "government" was the first one outside Hitler's Reich to adopt the Nuremberg Laws.

The revival of nationalism, militarism and revanchism in the German Federal Republic is a threat to peace and humanity, unquestionably. This threat grows in direct proportion to the praise and support the incorrigible fascists are gaining from the United States and her NATO allies. The memory of the Allied soldiers who died believing themselves to be freeing Europe from the Hitlerian nightmare, and the memory of the millions of innocent men, women and children who perished in Nazi concentration camps are being desecrated by those American politicians who lend comfort to the ever-growing aggressiveness of Hitler's political and spiritual offspring.

## ABOUT THE PRETEXT FOR EVADING A NUCLEAR TEST BAN

# Bomb or Quake



It has been argued that the U.S. should resume the testing of nuclear weapons because the Soviet Union may be doing so clandestinely. The ethical and political implications of this argument have been widely discussed before the general public. The empirical aspects of this problem have, unfortunately, received far less publicity. I would therefore like to tell about some work that has recently been done on detecting underground nuclear explosions. My discussion will be confined to the problem of underground explosions because the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. have agreed on the techniques for detecting other kinds of tests.

The major problem for the scientist, engaged in the design of a monitor system for the enforcement of a test ban treaty, is that of discriminating underground explosions from natural earthquakes. Let us begin by considering some of the differences between nuclear explosions and earthquakes which might be used in discriminating between them from a distance.

An underground nuclear explosion comes from a chain reaction which releases all of its energy in less than one millionth of a second. This energy release produces a temperature greater than a million degrees Kelvin in the next few millionths of a second. If the bomb is in a small chamber, this stage is followed by the expansion of the cavity until the pressure inside is equal to the pressure from the weighty rock and earth above. This results in a huge sphere, lined with about four inches of molten rock. Since the crushing of rock as the chamber expands results in a large transfer of mechanical (e.g., vibrational) energy to the surrounding earth, Edward Teller (U.S. technical consultant at Geneva) and others suggested that one could cheat with less chance of being found out if one were to test bombs in chambers so large that no expansion occurred after the explosion. Subsequent U.S. experiments with chemical explosions have shown that under ideal conditions this might reduce the apparent size of an explosion by a factor of three hundred. Under such conditions a pressure wave is spread through the room's atmosphere (which is so hot that electrons are not attached to their corresponding nuclei) and elastically absorbed by the surrounding walls.

Earthquakes are the sudden release of geological pressures which stress large volumes of material. To picture the mechanism, hold a pencil in front of you parallel to your shoulders gripping each end with your two hands as you would grip the handlebars of a bicycle. Now try to break the pencil by pulling your right hand in and pushing your left hand out. The break relieves the strain on the pencil producing two kinds of motion. (Toward you on the right and away on the left.)

Mr. Speeth, a full-time consultant for the Bell Telephone Laboratories, has been working on nuclear test monitoring systems. He has been recently assigned a Defense Department contract for research on a system deal with in the article here presented. He is a member of the Acoustical Society of America, the Sigma Xi and the Society for Social Responsibility in Science.

American-Soviet negotiations of a ban of nuclear bomb tests have been stalled because of the American negotiators' claim that such explosions could not be seismologically differentiated from earthquakes. A number of seismological studies conducted by qualified scientists suggest that this claim is politically motivated and scientifically unfounded. Jay Orear, Associate Professor of physics at Cornell University, suggested in the April, 1960 issue of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, that "The main cause of difficulties at this conference (the December 1959 American-Soviet technical talks in Geneva) was due to the political instructions given both sides, not to scientific disagreements. To accuse the Soviet scientific delegation of politically inspired behavior is to some extent a case of the pot calling the kettle black."

The President is sending Ambassador Arthur H. Dean to Geneva, on August 24th, to hold one more round of talks with Soviet representatives. The acknowledged technical preparations of the Atomic Energy Commission as well as the added military emphasis in the Administration's policy strongly suggest that Mr. Dean's true mission is not to ban nuclear testing, but to provide a pretext for its imminent resumption by the United States.

Against this background, the article here presented has important political implications.

—Ed.

### By Sheridan Speeth

Both explosions and earthquakes produce vibrations of the earth which are detectable at considerable distances. These waves are of three types; pressure waves, shear waves, and surface waves. To understand these, try to picture the following bizarre scene:

A group of people are standing in line as if waiting to enter a theater. Each has his hands on the shoulders of the person directly in front of him. At the end of the line someone sways forward and backward and this makes the person ahead of him do so too, and so on. The disturbance thus propagated from the end of the line to the front is a pressure or P wave. Were the person at the end of the line to change his swaying direction and begin to sway from left to right, pulling the man in front from left to right and so on, the disturbance sent along the line would be a shear or S wave.

P and S waves are produced by "seismic" events such as bombs and quakes; they are propagated through the earth's interior and emerge again at a continuous succession of points from the source. With an appropriate instrument, the seismometer, one can pick them up, graph them, and study their features. These waves are very low in frequency, and the range usually studied goes from one cycle every one-hundred seconds to one cycle per tenth second. There is a little-understood continuous source of background noise (called microseisms) which is very strong at around one cycle per second and less bothersome at higher and lower frequencies. There are various paths which a wave might take; this produces multiple effects much like echoes. A pressure wave (P) may be followed by a reflection from some distant part of the earth's surface (pP) and later by a refraction through the earth's core (PKP) and so on. The time of arrival of the various echoes can be used to judge the depths of earthquakes. These occur at depths of 60 to 400 kilometers, depths far deeper than any conceivable site of bomb tests.

Since an explosion pushes out in all directions whereas an earthquake both pulls and pushes, the ability to see clearly the direction of first motion in a seismogram would enable us to make an inspection decision. (A pull on any side means it must have been an earthquake.) Unfortunately, this only works for small distances when using single, high frequency seismometers on the earth's surface. This is due to the fading and distortion of the first motion signal combined with the interference due to noise (microseisms).

Tremendous progress has been made in overcoming these difficulties. Richard Roberts, of the Carnegie Department of Terrestrial Magnetism told, in his report to the Holifield committee, of his experience with seismometers lowered into oil well holes. The microseismic noise disappears as you go further under the earth's surface. Jack Oliver and others of the Lamont laboratory obtained similar results from ocean bottom seismometers. John Gerrard, Director of Earth Science Research at Texas

Instruments, Inc., described, in the Berckner Report to the State Department, how further signal enhancement may be achieved through the use of arrays of many seismometers. By carefully combining the inputs from such an array one can get a cancellation of noise while simultaneously increasing the strength of the signal. The square root of the number of seismometers used gives an estimate of the factor by which the signal-to-noise ratio can, in this way, be improved. Jack Oliver has shown how distortion problems are overcome when only the very low frequencies are studied, and John Tukey, Professor of Statistics at Princeton, has developed a computational technique for treating seismic data which makes it possible to determine first motion in spite of distortion.

My work in this area began with the following notion: Distinguishing an explosion from an earthquake may in many ways be similar to (and as complicated as) deciding which one of two of your friends is speaking on the telephone. Let us press this analogy by considering the input and response of both the seismometer and the telephone microphone. If your friend is in a normal room with plaster walls (plaster reflects 80 per cent of the sound which hits it), then there will be multiple arrival times for each of his vocal pressure waves, a parallel to the seismologists' P, pP, PP, and PKP, and other waves. The band-limiting performed by the telephone transmission corresponds to the narrow bandpass of most seismometers. If the friend's room were to contain machinery or other sources of noise, you would have to perform a task not unlike distinguishing a seismic signal from the noise of microseisms. If the voice decision were then made on the basis of vowel pronunciation, you would have demonstrated the ear's ability to use the information contained in the temporal dynamics of the short-time audio spectrum. The analogy could be indefinitely extended, but by now the experimental question should be obvious: Would any benefits for the seismologist accrue from having his seismometer output presented as an auditory display?

By playing back a magnetic recording of a seismometer's output at three hundred times the speed with which it was recorded, the frequencies are translated into a range where it is possible to listen to them discriminately. A series of experiments conducted last summer indicates that one can train listeners to distinguish the seismographs of earthquakes from those of underground explosions simply by their sound. Listeners were successful in separating one class events from the other in over 90 per cent of the cases presented, although the explosions studied were smaller than the "nominal yield" bomb discussed at Geneva. The events were monitored from as far as 4,000 kilometers.

What about cheating by the big-hole method suggested by Teller? The problem is much simpler than often claimed. Well over ninety per cent of the earthquakes in the Soviet Union occur in regions in which there are no

# THE WAY WE SEE IT

## Bidding For "Superior Loyalty"

The Texas state convention of the American Legion, recently held in Houston, has unintentionally performed a good service for democracy. Its resolution calling for Congressional investigations of the State Department and the Supreme Court are welcome if one is to accept the premise that the worse things get, the better. Especially tragic-comic is that people and agencies are hit who themselves have given a generous hand to the semantic surgery that turned "Communist!" from a statement of fact into an accusation. That they are being well baked in the fire they have helped to light is not the first disappointment of the one who abuses yet hopes never to be abused. Anyone have a grudge against Texas? — How about calling the Texan Legionnaires Communists? At least you'll have proved your superior "patriotism."

## Patriotic Theft

In the absence of law-enforcing agencies, how many Americans would indulge in thievery? I believe relatively few. Yet, these same people have no qualms about supporting thievery when it is committed by the Government under the camouflage of "patriotism." Judges, who normally mete out justice, sign authorizations for the State to steal. And officers who make a living from enforcing the law suddenly switch to executing "patriotic" robberies. And "fences" and customers are found for the stolen goods.

This is the way in which ten Cuban airplanes have been stolen; and hardly anyone in this country was outraged. That the Cubans have taken *legal* measures to nationalize some private property within their jurisdiction has been used as a rationale for committing outright international thievery. Only when an airplane made the route in the opposite direction, was there public outrage in America.

Dr. Castro was wise to turn the issue over to the U.N. Security Council. He knew that America, rather than let a theft remain unchallenged, would send her entire navy and air force to recover the stolen property. Indeed, the Cubans have no right to steal from us; not even when they "steal" property we had previously stolen from them. Our own actions involving ten Cuban airplanes are of a "different" nature altogether; they were acts of "patriotism." Come to think of it: hasn't Eichmann just claimed that he was an "idealist" and that all he did, he did because of his "patriotism"?

## Physicians and Morticians

Whatever else may be said about the American Medical Association, no one could accuse it of inaction or inanity. Its record is one of a bestower of mixed blessings. It could be symbolized by the smile on a cured child's face. But it could also be symbolized by a tombstone. A.M.A. promotes both. And more: Many a corporate share in the hands of an A.M.A. physician is a life lost to indiscriminate ad-

ministration of drugs. There is no bottom to A.M.A.'s passion for healing people, but there is also no bottom to A.M.A.'s lack of scruple in killing. As long as either is done by its members, and as long as either is paid for by patient and victim, A.M.A. insists on the doing.

It is hardly a coincidence that while engrossed in a battle against Government testing of drug claims, A.M.A. has also launched the American Medical Political Action Committee. The more anti-social A.M.A. becomes the more it feels a need to lobby. A day may come when A.M.A.'s collusion with the drug industry will be extended to include the nation's vast morgue-and-funeral industry. A.M.A.'s cycle will then be complete; with A.M.A. you'll be born, with A.M.A. you'll live or be poisoned, and with A.M.A. you'll die.

Yet, to judge the medical profession by A.M.A.'s lack of scruples would be grossly unjust. There are many thousands of American physicians whose ethical standards are of an altogether different and much superior level to those of the A.M.A. Many of them, risking the all-powerful wrath of A.M.A. are organizing themselves in a new upsurge of Hippocratic principles. All over the country A.M.A.-opposed groups of physicians spring up to save a noble profession from the immoral influence of a selfish, corrupt and anti-social bureaucracy. That they do so at a great personal risk is a tribute to their integrity. Three cheers for them!

## The Collegian's Minority\*

# AMERICAN STUDENTS AWAKEN

By Jonathan Eisen

The past two years, we are told, have been for the students of this country times of great political awakening. These have been years of growing reaction to previous lethargy, apathy,

\*This feature is reserved for contributions by students. Each contributor is awarded a complimentary subscription to *TMO* for himself or for the person or library of his choice.

Jonathan Eisen is a student at Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio. He is a member of the Student Peace Union and the campus NAACP. He is also the editor of *The Activist*, a student quarterly.

salt domes. Such salt domes would be prerequisite to detonating a nuclear bomb underground. Even where available, the salt domes would require steamdrilling that would take years to complete and astronomic funds. The relative geographic concentration of earthquakes on Russian territory provides important information when differentiating them from man-made underground explosions.

It was stated earlier that temperatures high enough to ionize the air of the test chamber were produced during the first few microseconds of a test. This mass of charged atoms and free electrons when churned by the bomb's shock wave (and its reflections) produces a strong, low frequency radio wave of the sort which Clark C. Abt (of the Raytheon Company) has found to be propagated underground. The bigger the hole, the more the ionized gas, and the louder the radio signal. Therefore, the more you try to cheat the seismic detectors the easier you would make it for the radio detectors. (See the July 17 issue of *AVIATION WEEK*.)

My point should by now be quite clear. As an engineering problem, detection of bomb explosions is not as difficult as it has been said to be. It has yielded to the techniques of modern engineering. The resumption of nuclear testing should not be blamed on the scientist, nor excused on semi-technological grounds.

The last two years, however, have been difficult; the N.S.A. is but an infant, and maturing is not an easy process. Some American students act on impulse and a strong sense of ethics. These have seen the wasteland of segregation and have declared it an evil — and then have acted on that declaration. They have seen the Cloud, and have reacted against it in ways obvious to them. They have heard their own voices — clear in the absence of weighty politics, unburdened by an ideological line. Spontaneous action has emerged by students who are unafraid; by young Democrats, Socialists, Communists, and some Republicans.

That the American youth is concerned with the anxieties of the cold war is unquestionable. That he is prepared or willing to prepare himself for the intricacies of its solution is doubtful. Americans, and among them most American students, are ignorant of the myriad problems that surround them. They have been fed on the milk of "patriotism" for so long that they have forgotten how to think. They have been intimidated to the point of renouncing the practice of their democratic ideals. Our newspapers, nearly all responsible to vested interests, have long since ceased to present intelligent

discussion. As George Orwell pointed out, fright and intense, blind loyalty make excellent partners. Our newspapers make use of this.

As for the students, our colleges and universities have failed to instill in them a desire and ability to question resourcefully. Our probings have been rudimentary and have either followed the pack of Republican editorialists, or have failed to crack the surface of time-worn cliches. We have been led. All of us.

All this reflects on the student movement in this country. We have acted emotionally, but without the political sophistication it takes to build an influential core of thought and opinion on major issues such as peace, civil rights, and the sterility of our society. It is precisely the students' inability to delve deeply into profound questions and to participate in an exchange of meaningful ideas that has severely limited them in the fields of action. Only now is the student beginning to realize that there are many problems that he never before thought existed. This may lead eventually to either blind activism or dogmatic slogan-screaming. Neither is the stuff that can build an effective, respected student movement in this country. Activism uncontrolled by social and political sophistication is foolish. Activism is relatively easy; knowledge and participation-in-depth are not.

Students must learn to relate their ideals to the world of realities; they must realize that problems are resolved not only by pickets and petitions. They must realize that to serve peace also involves working on and communicating thoughtful ideas and tolerant attitudes. Above all, the young people must know that their duty as world citizens is to judge from facts and values, and to criticize with the ultimate purpose of rebuilding in a better way.

## From READERS' LETTERS

### FURTHER RESPONSES TO "AN AMERICAN ALTERNATIVE" (TMO, July, 1961)

I have read with great interest your appeal for an American alternative. I am quite sure that there is a great need for more cooperation and unity of program among the individuals and peace organizations referred to in your "Memo to the Peace Movement." You may be interested in knowing that the Consultative Peace Council has only recently asked SANE to take the lead in a coordinated campaign this fall addressed to the Berlin issue. Some of us are hopeful that the experience of this campaign, if it matures, may provide a basis for further and more effective cooperation and coordination. One of the problems I find with your memo is that I believe you underestimate the problems raised by differences in thought and commitment within the peace movement. I am not sure whether it would be more effective for the various sections of the peace movement to try to resolve their differences to a degree which would allow for the broad, coordinated approach you describe, or whether it is better for us to work in the way we feel fits us best and trust that the over-all impact will grow in effectiveness. The coordinated effort sounds good, but an awful lot of time and energy can be wasted trying to coordinate something that depends for much of its power on a clear and consistently held idea and approach.

I am hopeful that the Consultative Peace Council initiative may lead us in the direction that you are concerned about.

STEWART MEACHAM  
Peace Education Secretary  
American Friends Service Committee

Philadelphia, Pa.

I agree with you that a newspaper to break the Paper-and-Air-Wave Curtain would be a splendid thing. But before launching it, I would advocate finding workable answers to the following questions: (1) how would you persuade unconvincing people to want to read it? (2) how would you deal with the foreseeable (false and malicious) attack "Oh, that paper, it is run by a bunch of Commies, you better not read it"; (3) how would you deal with the problem that some sections of the left, like SANE, insist that they will not have any person who can be called a Communist connected with them — and yet other sections of the left think that the problem of survival in the face of nuclear weapons is so important that they will judge anybody by his work and behavior and not by his reputation and background, and so they don't care a whit whether Communists are working with them or not?

In order to start the newspaper, I would suggest that those who want to start it organize together without waiting for the rest who will set conditions. Count on me for help and devotion.

E. C. BERKELEY  
Berkeley Enterprises, Inc.

Newtonville, Mass.

I think you are missing the real problem, and allowing yourself to be sidetracked by a side issue, the problem of inadequate coverage of activities of the peace movements by the American press. This is a side issue. The real problem is finding a genuine alternative to war as a means of settling international disputes. That alternative, experience tells us, must be world institutions of law and order, some form of world government, and our task is to create the public opinion in all countries, including especially the United States and the Soviet Union, to support such institutions. If we would put our whole hearts into this work, we would find that the positive nature of what we are trying to do would make itself felt, would attract support, and would gradually draw the world away from the negative preparations which ultimately will end in war.

DONALD SZANTHO HARRINGTON  
The Community Church of  
New York

New York, N. Y.

Your article "For an American Alternative" strikes me as the best idea that has appeared in this Twentieth Century. If there is not enough interest among the people of America to take this proposition up and to carry it successfully to the goal post, then we most certainly are doomed to extinction and rightfully deserve it. I pledge myself to the fullest of my ability, to support this lofty ideal physically, mentally, and financially.

O. K. SCOTT  
Prineville, Ore.

The article "For an American Alternative" strikes me as a remarkable analysis of an important problem in the peace movement and as a boldly intelligent proposal for its solution.

RICHARD GROFF

Amber, Pa.

I read your article, "Memo to the Peace Movement," and found it most suggestive. However, I regard as utterly impractical your plan of launching a great American progressive daily. The insuperable obstacle here is the financing. You talk jauntily of raising four or five million dollars for the enterprise. It will have to be more than that, because you would get precious little advertising, since U. S. business is by definition opposed to liberal programs.

Some years ago we tried all this with the DAILY COMPASS, when the general atmosphere was more favorable than now. Finally the few investors got tired of the deficit financing, and the COMPASS went under.

CORLISS LAMONT

New York, N. Y.

Since your article about having a national newspaper agrees completely with our own frustrated beliefs of long standing, we cheer your genius. Aside from what we could scrape up, we offer enthusiastically and instantly services and talents we possess to get the project rolling. And, there is no time to lose!

MR. & MRS. L. LLOYD SEIBEL

Orange, Calif.

Thank you for your fine and inspiring article. You have combined a clear analytical appraisal of the situation that exists in our press today with a clear call "to arms" with the only possible counter-force, truth.

If your sensible idea of the combining of efforts by all peace-minded individuals and groups to bring to the American public an awareness of the possibility of an alternative to the present insane dash toward suicide — if your idea takes root, I believe that I will be able to contribute a minimum of one hundred dollars toward this vital effort. It is possible that I may be able to contribute two hundred dollars.

PORTER GROFF

Cheltenham, Pa.

Splendid, the July issue — with your proposal to launch an offensive against the Paper Curtain, and presenting a documented example of the Curtain's existence as well, in Prof. Mintz's article on "The Cuban Episode" and the American Press." Your suggestion is definitely an example of larger thinking, and I hope it gains enough support to eventuate. Even with my admittedly pessimistic present view, I wish to be counted as a supporter of such a project.

Congratulations on a bold and realistic plan, and best wishes for success.

JEANNE BAGBY

Cave Creek, Ariz.

I was disappointed with the response to the "alternative" article particularly from such persons as Dr. Robert M. Hutchins and Rev. Homer Jack, although the former's pessimism is all too likely well grounded. But at this stage, can we dare to admit that it can't be done? The financial response, too, appears to be discouraging, for you should have been overwhelmed with contributions if not contributions. Yet, receipts were well below those of the preceding month. It would be tragic indeed if such a reasoned appeal were to frighten contributors away. Incidentally, "Soviet Unnegotiables" was excellent.

ROBERT S. CARMURN

Your lead article "Soviet Unnegotiables" (August, 1961 issue) is so very good — the real heart of the Berlin problem is set forth so clearly. If only it could reach all those people who read THE NEW YORK TIMES.

We felt more than a slight aggravation over Robert Hutchins' response, although he is one of our favorite people and we read with great interest and pleasure everything published by The Fund for the Republic. His words, in his letter to you, sounded as if they came from one suffering from a case of fatal ennui. If one could just pinch him once in a while and really bring him to life, wouldn't there be glorious fireworks?

EDNA MICKES  
(Mrs. John)

Chicago, Ill.

Your brilliant and objective analysis of, or rather for an "alternative," to which I most heartily agree in toto, should be made available now to every U.N. member; to the leaders of every nation, particularly the Afro-Asian and uncommitted groups; and to religious, educational and influential world leaders. It would seem our most formidable weapon now in the marshalling of world opinion for the support of those unassailable democratic principles you so courageously champion. It would thus tend to thwart those forces in our country which seem so hell-bent on blowing up the world. Let's not overlook the President (he is a TMO subscriber — Ed.); frontiersmen of every ilk; every State Department official and others for whom past and current issues of TMO should be required reading. Possibly by the law of osmosis the faintest glimmer of an awareness would seep through. TMO should be made available to students in colleges, to libraries and recreational reading rooms. Much of this program may be in effect now. However, to broaden your base of operations, enclosed is a check. Another of equal amount (\$250) will reach you in August.

May Divine Intelligence continue to guide and bless abundantly your work for Peace.

F. B.

Los Angeles, Calif.

I believe your "Memo" really goes to the root of the matter. Please use the enclosed contribution to mail copies of your July issues to all the peace organizations. I hope that this will be the seed thrown on good ground; that it will yield a hundredfold.

F. R. SCOTT

Friday Harbor, Wash.

### THAT'S HOW A MAGAZINE IS SOLD IN A "FREE" COUNTRY

I have been shown a copy of your publication by a newsdealer of my acquaintance, who, as he says, "keeps it under the counter." My feeling is, after reading it pretty thoroughly, that instead of being hidden, it should be displayed in all possible prominence. I am intensely interested in it and enthusiastically in accord with most of the comments, especially with Prof. G. d'Amato's article on "The High Cost of Free Admission" (August, 1961 issue). Television, as commonly utilized, is the worst cultural menace that has yet appeared, contributing more than anything else to the degeneration of culture and to the spreading moral decay.

I wish your paper could have as large a circulation as the SATURDAY EVENING POST.

MARC T. GREENE

Providence, R. I.

(Mr. Greene is a world-renowned American columnist and foreign correspondent. He has served in the American diplomatic service. He has been associated with many newspapers and magazines in the U. S., England, New Zealand and Australia.)

### NOT TO ABANDON PUBLICATION

I do not agree with everything you say, but there is a great deal of truth and much thought-provoking material in your magazine. The article on the John Birch Society in the June issue was especially good.

You are engaged in a most worthy cause, that of peace. In this age, when we are capable of destroying all, or a great portion of humanity, the preservation of peace is our most pressing social problem.

Your voice deserves to be heard, and I hope that you are not forced to abandon publication because of financial difficulties, or pressure from those who oppose your ideas.

MARK STOOKEY

St. John, Utah

### A MINORITY OF ONE IN ACTION

I was a minority of one — one white woman traveling with two Negro women and two Negro men — on the first NAACP test of bus terminals in Florida. Like many another who is set apart from his fellows because of an irrelevant difference in physical characteristics, I wanted to think of myself simply as one human being among others; but I was continually reminded, by newspaper reporters, TV photographers, and racial bigots, of my "difference."

My presence in the group evoked reactions which clearly indicate the sexual sickness that underlies race prejudice. Although the "welcoming committees," who gathered at the stations, were generally quite restrained (we were well guarded by police), some comments relating to race-and-sex could not be suppressed. When I sat next to one of the men in our party, at the Tallahassee lunch counter, a male bystander said, "I'd like to get hold of her and make her kiss him." Later, another called out, "Did you sleep with him last night?"

While I was gone, my husband received two telephone calls from women advising him that he ought to be ashamed of me. And when I returned, I got a call from a man with a fake Negro accent and a leering voice, asking obscenely if I wanted to go for a ride with him.

LORRAINE CALHOUN

Port Orange, Fla.

### THE DISCERNING MIND OF SOMEONE IN GEORGIA

My husband happened across your magazine the other day and we have found it most informative. However, I do have one suggestion: to save the time of your readers, why don't you state on the first page that you are an unofficial organ of the Communist Party and that The Friends of The Minority of One is a front group.

ELEANOR M. WILLERWERTH  
(Mrs. Robert P.)

Atlanta, Ga.

### EDITORS CAN DISAGREE YET RESPECT EACH OTHER

I like your publication very much. In the first place, I am in love with its name and, secondly, with the trend. As you know, the JEWISH NEWSLETTER also aspires to being a dissenting voice. But we apply it only to one corner of life — Jewish problems — while you embrace the entire world. I like your approach and a great deal of your criticism.

I was very tempted to write you personally or even reply publicly to your criticism of the JEWISH NEWSLETTER ("Trial and Error in Assimilation," May, 1961 issue of TMO). But I was swamped with more topical events. I may return to the subject in an article in a forthcoming issue of the JN.

WILLIAM ZUCKERMAN, Editor  
Jewish Newsletter

New York, N. Y.

### FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK

A book on Cuba we wish to recommend to our readers is M-26, *Biography of a Revolution* by Robert Taber. The author, presently in Cuba, is the Executive Secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. It is one of the most comprehensive volumes on Cuba. Available at \$4.95 from Lyle Stuart, Publisher, 225 Lafayette St., New York 12, N. Y.

A highly interesting documentary record, entitled "Sounds of Protest" and dealing with the demonstrations against the House Committee on Un-American Activities in San Francisco, is available at \$2.00 from SLATE, Box 893, Berkeley, California.

### THE PUBLISHERS OF THIS ISSUE

The following individuals have made it possible for us to continue publication through membership fees in The Friends of The Minority of One, sponsorship and sporadic donations, and gift subscriptions received during July 1961:

F. B. —\$250, Dr. Stuart Kabinick —\$100, L. K. —\$100, G. D. —\$70, Robert Grossman —\$50, Fritz Maytag —\$25, Juliet C. Perkins —\$25, David B. Phillips —\$25, Samuel Sloan, Esq. —\$25, W. H. Ferry —\$20, Ruth Vollmer —\$20, Eugene Lipshultz —\$15, Mr. & Mrs. James L. Perkins —\$15, Mrs. Alex Munsell —\$14, Hyman Bogasky —\$10, Fred F. Borts —\$10, Edward Florance —\$10, Janice Holland —\$10, John W. Mettam —\$10, Albert A. Sanders, Esq. —\$10, F. R. Scott —\$10, Mrs. Lydia R. Shrebinick —\$10, J. S. —\$10, Rosamond P. Taylor —\$10, Richard L. Yudell —\$9, Felix de la Torre —\$8, G. Gamil —\$8, Lee Silberstein —\$8, Lulu W. Draper —\$6, Lola Boswell, Atty —\$5, Dr. R. F. Burlingame —\$5, Roy E. Coupal —\$5, Mrs. A. Henry Cuneo —\$5, Henry R. Diskant —\$5, Fred Dusek —\$5, E. E. Garlit —\$5, Mrs. Hannah Green —\$5, Elmer K. Hansen —\$5, Mrs. Arvin E. Klemane —\$5, Mary Phillips —\$5, Richard A. Potomak —\$5, Irving Prushan —\$5, Thor Twiford —\$5, P. E. Wilkins —\$5, Mr. & Mrs. E. C. Berkeley —\$4, William F. Davis —\$4, Alia Powers —\$4, Owen Freeman —\$2, Manuel Machado —\$2, Mrs. George Ritoch —\$2, Carl S. Tobie —\$2, Harold Verb —\$2, and J. C. —\$1.05. TOTAL \$991.05



## Of What I Am Ashamed:

► OF THE HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE for tabling the Administration's bill that would provide federal aid to schools.

► OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES MAJORITY for rejecting legislation to increase the efficiency of the National Labor Relations Board.

► OF THE MEMBERS OF THE FORMER EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION for having, while in office, kept certain records secret for purely partisan reasons, as established in a report by the House Government Operations Committee.

► OF ROBERT S. McNAMARA, Secretary of "Defense"

— for endorsing the pressure by West Germany's "Defense" Minister Franz Josef Strauss to increase the nuclear power of NATO;

— for promoting a fallacious program to build fallout shelters, in an attempt to lull the American people into a false sense of security.

► OF AVERELL HARRIMAN, U. S. Roving Ambassador, and his State Department superiors for obstructing a proposal at the Laos peace conference in Geneva for the complete withdrawal of all foreign military personnel from Laos.

► OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD and his congressional backers for promoting legislation authorizing the use of wire-tapping by federal law-enforcing officers.

► OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION for completing preparations for nuclear tests even before their resumption was decided upon by the U. S. Government.

► OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES for voting that military enlistees must swear before God their allegiance to the Constitution.

► OF SENATOR EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, the Senate Republican leader, and CONGRESSMAN CHARLES A. HALLECK, the House Republican leader, and their Congressional supporters for conducting a campaign against United States recognition of China and Outer Mongolia.

► OF THE U. S. AIR FORCE for ordering enlisted men and officers to put on civilian clothes and to take with their families a "spontaneous" welcoming demonstration for Pakistan's President Mohammad Ayub Khan, on his arrival in the U. S.

► OF THE STATE GOVERNORS ROSS BARNETT (Miss.), JIMMIE DAVIS (La.), ORVAL FAUBUS (Ark.), ERNEST VANDIVER (Ga.), ERNEST HOLLINGS (S. C.), and JOHN PATTERSON (Ala.) for sponsoring a conference to further white supremacy in their respective States.

► OF JOSEPH MITCHELL, city manager of Newburgh, N. Y. for denying his city's relief funds to unwed mothers and to arbitrarily disqualified unemployed men.

► OF SENATOR WALLACE F. BENNETT, former president of the National Association of Manufacturers, for condoning banking malpractices by opposing legislation which would require lenders of loans to disclose the true interest rates to borrowers.

► HALF A CHEER for ALLEN W. DULLES for the first constructive decision in his adult life: to retire as director of the Central Intelligence Agency — his first true service to America.

replaced in most places" and that "we have enough idle capacity in most fields to provide whatever additional production may be required to equip and supply any units that may be called up." Such is the anatomy of American prosperity that it is predicated on the terror of every human being in this generation . . .

There is a disconcerting unanimity between the above quotes and the Tass comment on President Kennedy's July 25th talk. The latter states: "Washington apparently decided to use an old recipe to try and speed up, by means of injecting large military appropriations, the slow process of reviving the United States economy after prolonged slump." Tass further hypothesizes: "If there were no West Berlin problem, the imperialist quarters would have all the same invented a pretext for stepping up the armaments race to solve with its help the internal and external problems besetting the United States and its nearest forces in the North Atlantic bloc." This hypothesis is contradicted neither by Reston's information that Washington regarded the Berlin crisis "as a political opportunity," nor by the quite suggestive editorial in the July 27th WASHINGTON POST. It stated, ". . . the Kennedy message extended far beyond the Berlin dispute. Even if that crisis should recede, most of the (military) measures he (the President) recommended would still be necessary . . ."

The American-Soviet unanimity of interpretation of the Berlin crisis is not less than sensational. It proves that the American leaders need not hide their insidious manipulations before a populace quite ready to support insidious manipulations.

President Kennedy's slogan "We Aim for Peace" has a built-in mechanism for yet another falsehood. If general war does not break out before his campaign for a second term, his supporters will undoubtedly credit this to the "clairvoyance" and "success" of his policy. The Soviet Union's aversion to a world conflagration will be misrepresented as a reaction to Kennedy's muscle-flexing.

\* \* \* \* \*

On the propagandistic level, President Kennedy and his aides have adopted the slogan of German self-determination as the "principled" rationalization for their position on Berlin. This rationalization is based on such an obviously false premise that it is reminiscent of the amateurish rationalizations that were produced by the clumsy psychological warfare specialists of the Eisenhower era. The truth of the matter is that the peace treaty the Soviets want to sign with the Germans is intended to conclude a war that was fought by them and the Western Allies in order to *defy German self-determination*. If it is intolerable, in President Kennedy's words, to act against the Germans' right "to determine their own future and choose their own way of life," then indeed we should never have fought a war with Nazi Germany in the first place. The President cannot invoke American rights of conquest to justify American presence in Berlin while simultaneously insisting that Soviet presence in Germany should be subject to a free German endorsement. It was not the Germans who insisted on their unconditional surrender during World War II, and there is no legal basis for insisting that the only authors of a German peace treaty be the Germans themselves. The struggle in Germany is precipitated by the American desire to nullify the Soviet part in the victory over Germany. As far as the Soviets are concerned, we wish to bring about a *status quo ante*. That the Soviets will become involved in another war rather than allow the German surrender to be distorted to a one-sided increase of Western security and to a threat against the U.S.S.R. is a historic and geographic compulsion.

July 27, 1961

## The Manufactured Crisis

mean that he (President Kennedy) is using the Berlin alarm in a deceptive way."

In any case, the assumption that President Kennedy wanted "a lot of things done, anyway," but his doing them depended decisively on Khrushchev's initiative is either unrealistic and naive or intentionally misleading; it completely omits the power of the American President to stage justifications for actions desired by him.

If Berlin as a short-range objective was not the one for which the military build-up was undertaken; and if the military build-up started a struggle that is expected to last "a great many years," what is the true objective of the military build-up? The only plausible answer is that it constitutes a purpose in itself. It amounts to a heightening of the international arms-race and as such it follows a philosophy President Kennedy has been prescribing to the American people ever since his election cam-

## Crisis (Continued from page 1)

paign. When Reston states, "What started in January as a discussion of disarmament is now turning into a more serious arms race," and then correctly concludes that "this is clearly not what Khrushchev wanted," the puzzle of who wanted the "more serious arms race" is no longer a puzzle.

In specific terms, Reston informs us that the "things . . . that President Kennedy wanted . . . anyway" were: "greater military power in Germany, a stronger America with more arms and less unemployment, a faster pace toward the unification of Western Europe." In anticipation of the President's address on Berlin, THE NEW YORK TIMES of July 22nd almost jubilantly prognosed (in what might have been a hint to the stock market) that "the economy as a whole has enough of a margin, in terms of the still high level of unemployment, to assure that those called up could be easily